

The University of Akron IdeaExchange@UAkron

The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle

5-3-2007

Faculty Senate Chronicle for May 3, 2007

Richard Stratton

Please take a moment to share how this work helps you [through this survey](#). Your feedback will be important as we plan further development of our repository.

Follow this and additional works at: <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate>

Recommended Citation

Stratton, Richard. "Faculty Senate Chronicle for May 3, 2007." *The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle*, 3 May 2007. *IdeaExchange@UAkron*, <http://ideaexchange.uakron.edu/universityofakronfacultysenate/88>

This Article is brought to you for free and open access by IdeaExchange@UAkron, the institutional repository of The University of Akron in Akron, Ohio, USA. It has been accepted for inclusion in The University of Akron Faculty Senate Chronicle by an authorized administrator of IdeaExchange@UAkron. For more information, please contact mjon@uakron.edu, uapress@uakron.edu.



2006-2007, No. 8

May 3, 2007

55 pages

SENATE ACTIONS

- **Motion to approve Guidelines for Absence due to Participation in University
Sponsored events page 11**
- **Approved list of candidates for the summer graduation page 14**
- **Motion to authorize the Executive Committee to communicate on behalf of the
Faculty Senate supporting the House and or Higher Education budgets
..... page 30**
- **Received oral report from ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee
..... page 13**
- **Received oral report from Student Affairs Committee page 13**
- **Briefed by John Allison, UA's legislative liaison, on the current status of the state
budget and issues important to higher education in Ohio page 14**
- **Continued discussion of proposal to modify the governance structure and creation
of University Council page 20**

Any comments concerning the contents in *The University of Akron Chronicle*
may be directed to the Secretary, Richard Stratton (x7440).

facultysenate@uakron.edu

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting held May 3, 2007	3
--	---

Appendices to Minutes of Faculty Senate Meeting of May 3, 2007

A. Executive Committee Report	32
B. Academic Policies Committee Report/Nutrition Center Motion	33
C. Draft of Administrative Progress Review	35
D. University Council Process	38
E. Motion in regard to Establishing Guidelines for Student Absence	39
F. Proposals approved by the Provost	42
G. Final 2007 Summer Graduation Statistics	47
H. Summer Fellowships Awarded	53
I. Student Advisory Committee Report	55

Minutes of the Faculty Senate Meeting of May 3, 2007

The regular meeting of the Faculty Senate took place Thursday, May 3, 2007, in Room 201 of the Buckingham Center for Continuing Education (BCCE). Senate Chair Rudy Fenwick called the meeting to order at 3:13 p.m.

Of the current roster of fifty-five Senators, 35 were present for this meeting. Senators Barrett, Broadway, S. Clark, Goodson-Beal, Hamed, John, Keltyka, Kreidler, Lillie, Plummer, Sadler, Schantz, Vijayaraman, Vinnedge and Wilburn were absent with notice. Senators Bramlett, Ida, Ofobike and Wally were absent without notice.

I. Approval of the Agenda – Chair Fenwick welcomed senators to the May and last meeting of the Faculty Senate for this year. The first order of business is approval of the agenda. Senator Norfolk moved to approve the agenda and Senator Hajafar seconded. The agenda was approved.

II. Approval of the Minutes – Chair Fenwick asked for consideration of the minutes of the Senate meeting. Senator Rich moved to approve the minutes of March 1st, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting and Senator Qammar seconded. There being no corrections, the minutes were approved.

Senator Qammar moved to approve the minutes of April 5th, 2007 Faculty Senate meeting and Senator Clark seconded.

Senator Gerlach noted that on page 11 in the middle of the page, the paragraph beginning with his name should be corrected in two small ways. First, “Chair” should be changed to Chairman. He never refers to the Chairman as Chair. He always says Mr. Chairman, because he does not believe the Chairman is an object like a chair. Second, the word “does” in that first line does not fit there and should be deleted. The sentence should read: “when is the Senate going to be presented...” not “when does is the Senate...”. The minutes were approved as amended.

III. Chairman's Remarks & Special Announcements – Chair Fenwick began his remarks with several obituaries. “During the last month three of our former colleagues passed away. Donald Allen Zimmerman passed away April 13. Don was a professor at the University of Akron for 25 years and received Outstanding Teacher of the Year Award in 1994 at Community and Technical College, it's Summit College now. He was a graduate of Defiance College and University of Pennsylvania Wharton Business School. Robert Sherwood Sartoris, a native of Kent died April 11. Bob worked at Goodyear Aerospace for awhile. At The University of Akron he served as director of publications, professor of Journalism and advisor for the Buchtelite yearbook. And Jean Lachman passed away April 30. She received her masters in physical education from Iowa State and then joined The University of Akron in the early 1940's, teaching physical education, Latin and Greek. Talk about a scholar. And finally I would be remiss if I didn't pay tribute to our colleagues, faculty and students, who were murdered at Virginia Tech a few weeks ago, as we look back at the history of American society and American violence over the last several years, April is an especially cruel month; Virginia Tech, Columbine and the Edward Murrow bombing. So with that in mind would the Senate please rise for a moment of silence?” (Senate observed moment of silence)

“Thank you. We have a fairly busy agenda today, and so I'm going to keep my remarks short. I would like to pay tribute to people who are leaving us, not for the hereafter hopefully but just leaving this body. First of all Professor Tom Dukes, the Associate Provost. Tom has only been in the office a year or so. It's been our privilege and pleasure working with Tom, his sense of humor will be missed in the Faculty Senate. He's going back to teaching full time in the English department. Tom will give a report later but good luck and best wishes, I'll get to join you more often in Olin Hall. We'll go over to Starbucks and have coffee and talk about the good old times next year. And I'd like for senators who are ending their term today to please stand, those who are not going to be on the Senate next year, to recognize these people. Look around at your colleagues, some very good colleagues. Tim Norfolk, who I'm still looking for the bylaw that requires his presence on Senate, which he just mentioned to me he's been here thirteen years and been on the Senate twelve. Mike Cheung, the former Chair of the Senate. Steve I know, Russ Davis, Kushner-Benson, Susan, some of you I know more than others. Kate certainly for years, going back to the budgeting and planning committee, and Bill Lyons, just down the hall. My appreciation to you all for your fine service over the last six or twelve years. There goes Ollie back there hiding behind Mike. Appreciate it. So let's give our departing colleagues a hand for their service (applause). Thank you again. And after today you can relax, even though your term doesn't officially end until September. And other than that I just wish everybody a very nice summer, it finally feels like spring the last few days. And for those who are returning in September why I'll see you one more time in September. And now I'd like to turn over the meeting to Secretary Stratton.”

IV. Reports –

a. Executive Committee – Senator Stratton reported the Executive committee met on April 19th first to set the agenda for today and later met with the President and the Provost. At the meeting with the President and Provost the following issues were discussed. The conversations between the College of Fine and Applied Arts and the Nursing College continue. The Provost shared a draft document that indicated a possible administrative structure for the academic health center and we reviewed possible external partners for the health center. The President provided an update on the Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration Commission. The update on the proposed compact between the legislature and higher education focused on understanding its possible impact on the state budget and how it might affect The University of Akron. We discussed the changes in the student discipline merit code. We were assured that no changes have yet been made and that Senate representation will be included in the process of drafting such changes. We were assured that no recommendations about student disciplinary changes would go the Board this month. We recognized the broad scope of the student success initiatives and recommendations. We agreed on the need to coordinate such a far reaching initiative and briefly discussed how that might be accomplished.

Finally there was some discussion of how the University Council proposal might proceed and a suggestion that the Senate might benefit from having an update on the University Park Alliance initiative.

There being no questions for Senator Stratton, Chair Fenwick invited the Provost to report, since the President was not in attendance.

b. Remarks from the Provost –

Provost Strobe reported: “President’s not here today, I’ll cover an array of topics but I promise not to try to use two people’s times. I reflected too on the need to make it part of the record, a response and thoughtfulness about the Virginia Tech circumstances and I don’t think words I have are any more meaningful than the meaning that Paul Levy brought to this so I’ve given you his words that were in e-mail digest to make it part of the record of this body but I would particularly like to read the last two paragraphs. (see appendix B) Dr. Levy says: “I think the more important question is: Are each of us making contributions to our university community in ways similar to or different from the ways that we have heard so much about over the past week? The heroic efforts of many Tech students and faculty were revealed. People died or risked their lives to help others. Individuals showed an inordinate amount of courage to face the tragedy head on. Folks were not ashamed to share their emotions with others as an outward and visible sign of their love of others, their university, and their community. The “Virginia Tech Family” has shone brightly throughout this tragedy and its students have been the brightest of all. What happened to the Tech family was terrible and senseless. How they deal with this heartbreak is what will ultimately define them. I am seeing great strength from the Virginia Tech community now and I anticipate great things in the future.”

Paul goes on to say: “I ask each member of our “Akron Family” to stand up and evaluate what contributions we’re making to our community and to each other. I believe that how we deal with and react to those things that surprise us, excite us, educate us, and engage us is how we too will be ultimately defined. My prayers go out to my Tech brothers and sisters and especially to the families who have suffered such great losses. Meanwhile, my hopes and dreams are right here with my Akron family – hopes and dreams of strengthened relationships, loyal support, a common purpose, and meaningful contributions from each and every one of us to our University of Akron community.”

And I thank Paul for his willingness to take a very personal reflection and share it with us.

I titled this middle section leadership begins with you. It’s a time when leadership transitions are in the making and celebrations of people who have given some time to a very formal study of leadership and recruitment of people who will engage in that activity for the coming year. So the Academic Leadership Forum, they call it ALF for short, I loved that TV show so, I like using ALF for their name. They have a guest speaker coming Monday, Lorraine R. Matusak, who was a program officer with the Kellogg Foundation. She’s coming to talk from her book which is very much about how every person can be a leader; that leadership isn’t about formal leadership positions it’s about how you identify the arena in which you can bring expertise and knowledge and commitment and play a leadership role. We’re taking applications and nominations for the next year’s cohort group on Academic Leadership Forum - that will be year three. I’m taking nominations for Ohio Academic Leadership Academy, this is a group put together by the IUC Provost. Bill Lyons represented our institution this year, in the first year; we’re recruiting for a second year. And tomorrow we will give out some shared leadership awards at Founder’s Day. You’re going to recognize some of the people that get those awards tomorrow. And finally in the leadership transition category, you saw e-mail digest today and as you’ve acknowledged Dr. Dukes has decided to make a transition in his

role. In his honor I'd like to propose a toast, to the qualities that he truly embodies and are qualities that I hope to achieve myself; reasonableness, good humor and appreciation for diverse viewpoints. And so Tom here's to you and here's to us. Hear hear! Thank you.

Just a few updates. Budget priorities have been sorted out by the Budget Hearing Group, which is a subset of Operations Advisory Committee. What came back in those budget priorities is we actually put together a budget and know what our revenue and expenditure picture is going to be. Truly enrollment related expenses come in at the top of the list. Enrollment related expenses primarily being of course hiring of individuals who can teach the classes, but that's not the only enrollment related request. We're all starting to feel the stretch of space and time and all the kinds of issues that come with the good news of growing enrollment. Everybody said those kinds of things that help us meet enrollment demand really need to be funded first. Then from there the budget priorities moved on to things like operating budgets, but only where those were attached to actually needed to support enrollment growth, and then it just sort of went on from there. But enrollment growth is the very common theme across the things that were rated as high priorities. So as we put together what our revenue projections look like as well as our expenditures we'll start to figure out what can actually be funded in what order and I expect John Allison can give you an update about where the state budget picture looks right now because it's still not finished. And until that's finished we don't know what our new enrollment actually translate to in terms of dollar figures. The other piece of data we're waiting for is that this year because we have a much more systematic and formal enrollment management plan is that we actually did what most institutions do and that's to set a May 1st commitment date. So unlike past years where we were learning typically in August what the new freshman class was going to look like and scrambling to figure out how to add sections, I expect in the next week to have a pretty good picture of what the fall freshman class looks like size-wise, admission status-wise and all the kind of factors that help take money that we've been setting aside just for this purpose and allocate it out to units: to say what do you need to do in terms of academic investment funds and what do we need to do in terms of new dollars that we provide to you to be able to staff those freshman classes. So I think while the timing optimally would still have been earlier than now, from practical purposes May 1st is probably where we're going to end up because that's how most institutions handle their fall enrollment. So I hope in the next couple of weeks to be able to get news out to departments about here are the dollars that you have to make some additional hires.

Administrative program review: A topic I'm asked about with some frequency is "well why are the academic units the only ones under scrutiny in a program review cycle and why aren't others getting the same kind of scrutiny?" I've said all along that wasn't the intent was that just one side of the house would have program review. So what I did was draft for the Chairs a couple of weeks ago a chart that shows where the administrative program review processes are already underway or completed.(see Appendix C) What I think remains to be done and I've asked Chand Midha to do this, is to put together a formal administrative program review committee and a five-year cycle and Chand and I are close to having that committee finished but not completely, so I won't share the membership with you today but we're getting there with appropriate constituent representation we hope that's our goal and so we're still needing to put a few people in place. But I think administrative program review won't work on the same five-year cycle like academic program review does

because you can see some of these topics really can't wait five years to be addressed, you know if you discover you've got a serious operational issue you can't say oh well that in year 04 that we're reviewing that topic. So we'll go ahead and tackle it and I think it will be much more of a continuous quality improvement cycle and not so much periodic review although I will actually ask the committee to do a cycle that says if we haven't done the review for any others purposes what year do we review that particular unit, so that we don't miss something as a result of being too casual about it. So that's a draft for your information.

Enrollment management road map: Bill Kraus, our enrollment manager, has put together a document we've been sharing it with various audiences. He's going to start meeting with particular academic units because when we talk about enrollment management and what's the capacity in the institution, that's very broad strokes. And we really need to get to the point of program by program capacity analysis because that varies. Whether you have enough lab space, whether you can provide enough graduate assistanceships at the right level, faculty whether they're even enough faculty who can be hired regardless of whether the funding is available, all those tend to come down to specific program level decisions and that's what Bill Kraus will work on next and all projections are a little early for me to tell you how it looks but it's trending in a very positive direction.

Searches underway and those to come: We continue to have some dean searches that have not closed yet. The news that I want to share with you that I just became aware of yesterday and was communicated to the search committee this afternoon is that we came down to a finalist that I offered the Chief Diversity Officer position to, we were extremely impressed by him and I made a competitive generous offer which he acknowledged but he turned down. And the reason he turned it down was that he was newly married, I think he married like the weekend before he came to interview which was maybe two weeks ago, when it came right down to it his wife wasn't willing to relocate and new marriage it just didn't seem like they wanted to commute and he could not persuade her. She works in marketing for Proctor and Gamble and has a northeast US assignment and he's at Connecticut Stores. He tried to convince her to relocate her work back to Cleveland market and she said nope, no comparison I just can't do it from a career viewpoint. So, I'll have to think about what we do next. I think we don't immediately go back out for a search because frankly our search committee is a little fatigued. So we need to give ourselves a little bit of a break now and figure out what our strategy is that's next but we thought we had the job done and it's hugely disappointing to not have done that.

On May 16th I'm meeting with the Student Success and Retention Committee. You've heard the reference in Executive Committee meeting we talked a little bit about how would leadership look and how would leadership function to make sure this is a strategic move on the institution's part. I want to get the advice of the Student Success and Retention Committee before I do anything. I had some ideas I'm sure I think those are the right ideas, so I want to hear from the committee and then I'll know what I'm doing next and Dr. Dukes has put together an NCA self-study committee, I'll meet with them soon. We've been doing work to get ready for NCA for years but now we really need a committee that helps to construct the self-study and the document room. Dr. Dukes has consented to continue as a member of that committee and I think that's very good. Thank you."

Provost Stroble apologized that she had skipped one item and so continued. “I gave you a chart (see Appendix D) that shows you our process for gathering input and feedback and providing it to the exploratory committee. As I understand it our current position in the process, is that we’re in these boxes that go across the middle of the chart. And almost every constituency has been hugely challenged to get very robust participation in the feedback process. I don’t know how the two-way survey for Faculty Senate went but I certainly know, because I sit in Council of Deans and VPs meetings both, that getting the robustness of the response that would give you any confidence that the response was meaningful just has not happened even though we’ve spent a lot of time on it. So I made the commitment given the need to move along, that I would nudge both Council of Deans and the VPs to wrap this up and to provide feedback that we think would be meaningful and to help inform revisions so that we get to the point that we start moving down the chart to the more formal approval kind of stage. So that this afternoon a document which I think of as response part one went to the University Council exploratory committee and we will follow up with part two, part one describes how we’re going to respond and what we’re going to look at in the document. Part two will actually be the response and we’ll actually move along on that and get it done. So our commitment as the Council of Deans and VPs is that we will achieve 100% participation when we provide our feedback back to you and nothing short of that. So that’s where that process is and I think that finishes my remarks now. Thanks again.”

Chair Fenwick asked if there were any questions or comments for the Provost.

Senator Gerlach: “On March 1st this body passed a motion requesting the administration to include on the Health Insurance Benefits Committee one voting member representing Wayne College, one representing our retirees/dependents and one administrative member. I’m wondering what action has been taken, if anything what response from the administration has been to that request?”

The Senate agreed to allow Vice President Case to respond.

VP Case indicated that as a newcomer he was unsure of the procedures. He talked about the issue at the last meeting of the Senate and discussed it with Rudy the following week. Since Rudy had not provided a formal response, he continues to be unsure of the next step of the process.

Provost Stroble asked if a memo came from Faculty Senate to the President as an action item. Once that memo is received the administration typically responds in writing to that. The written memo from the Senate tends to trigger the written response.

Chair Fenwick and the Provost agreed to investigate where the issue is in the system and make sure the loop gets closed.

Senator Davis informed the Senate that one representative on that committee is now from the Wayne Campus, though not a not a faculty member.

Senator Gerlach continued with a second question. “We understand from various sources of information that a report has been prepared by a consultant on parking. And that consultant has recom-

mended that everyone pay for parking, specifically us retirees. I have two things to respond to that and I hope the administration will take note of them. One of the things we have long enjoyed as a benefit dates back to the time of the old University Council passed a faculty bill of rights. One section of that applied to retired and emeritus faculty. And one of those features was no fee parking in any university lot except in metered and handicapped areas of campus. I beg to inform the Senate too that Dr. Thomas Vukovich who was once Associate Provost for Student Affairs and is now the President-Elect of our retirees association has communicated to Dr. Case, the Vice President for Finance a couple of points that I'd like to put on record here. He said in this letter amongst some other things, these are the best of it 'I must point out that we take exception to any notion of charging a fee to retirees which choose to receive a parking permit. Those retirees generally come to campus when invited to attend various department meetings or to provide services for the welfare of the university committee. As co-chair for the retiree's university family campaign to solicit funds for a ten million dollar development effort, I believe it would be a poor time to give retirees reasons to feel alienated by taking away the option of free parking permits that would cause retirees to reject our call for general donations and specifically for their support of a recently established endowed scholarship fund proposed by our retiree's committee to celebrate our tenth anniversary.'

I must say that the position of retirees has been pretty generous in past years, our current president reported in our last executive meeting that from the development office he was informed that for the year 2004-05 for example retired faculty and others contributed well over a quarter of a million dollars to this university. And what I want to say here is if we're now to face reneging on such nice little perquisites as this which we've long enjoyed, it puts a very sour taste in my mouth and I'm sure it will in others. And all I can say is if this kind of treatment of the retirees persists or it continues; don't expect me for one to endow a chair in the History Department. Or any other substantial sum and I say with particular emphasis. I have long enjoyed the relationship with this university where I taught 32 years and have participated in its life and various ways. I have benefited from the university, the university has benefited from me. And I think it's time that someone spoke up for all of my fellow retirees to remind you all that we are not insignificant members of this community, we still take a certain pride in being associated with it. If we are going to be treated like this, like second class citizens you can't expect very positive response from us. Or at least let me say for myself I'd be very turned off. So I beg you Madame Provost to convey this kind of information to the President and the Vice President's here to hear it, and consider very carefully these reactions and that goes back to the point too about this retiree member on the Benefits Committee. I understand that quite a number, about 700 dependents of retirees who are covered by the program and that gives us as a group a particular interest that I think ought to be considered and recognized by a seat on this committee, it isn't all that large anyway. Thank you for your attention."

Provost Stroble: "I'm glad to listen and I think particularly on the parking issue it's my understanding that the Parking Committee is gathering information and input now so it's timely and really we've been gathering input through open forums as well as through e-mail and web survey. If you wanted to give your statement to us in writing we could make it part of the record and available to the Parking Committee."

Senator Gerlach responded that the letter he was quoting, from Dr. Vukovich to Dr. Case, must be part of the record so that's covered.

Chair Fenwick, with the consent of the Senate, recognized Vice President Case.

Vice President Case indicated that Dr. Vukovich's letter went to the Parking Committee itself. He then wanted the Senate to be aware that the Executive Committee had been asked to recommend a representative from the Faculty Senate to the Parking Task Force. The Executive Committee recommended Senator Harvey Sterns, who now serves on it. He praised Senator Sterns for his work on the task force and suggested that the retirees are well represented by him. He hopes the retirees would use Senator Sterns for input in the future.

Senator Sterns: "Well you know it's very important to hear Dr. Gerlach's words. But let me just respond in a different way. This is a consultant's report and that's all it is. They've made many recommendations which may or may not be received positively by the committee. It was a way to find an objective fact-finding. So we are on notice, I think we hear loud and clear what the retiree's are saying, but I don't think anything has happened yet that would lead to the need to be reminded so severely. But I'm certainly put on notice. There are many many things in this report that we looked at and I will probably look at it later on but thank you for sharing that."

Chair Fenwick assured Senator Gerlach that the Executive Committee will look into whether that memo was sent from us to the President, if not one will be sent tomorrow. He then moved on to committee reports and invited Associate Provost Dukes to give the Academic Policies report.

c. Academic Policies Committee report

Dr. Dukes: "Thank you, before I read this I would like to thank you all for your kind acknowledgements, especially Rudy and the Provost. I would like to acknowledge the warmth, humor and efficiency of the Academic Policies Committee and the Curriculum Review Committee, who brought just all kinds of wonderful things to our work. Mostly in the patience and unceasing hope that the door to our meeting room would be unlocked when we got there. It never was, our hopes were always dashed, but still but we showed up to do our work.

This is a motion in regard to establishing guidelines for absence due to participation in University-sponsored events. The Academic Policies Committee met and unanimously supported the establishment of a policy regarding student absences due to their participation in university-sponsored events. (see Appendix E)

Be it resolved that the policy Guidelines for Absence due to Participation in University Sponsored events be adopted.

Rationale: Because penalizing students for their absences due to their participation in university-sponsored events may undermine the student success that comes from an educational experience where curricular and co-curricular activities are complementary, the APC was asked to consider developing attendance guidelines for such student absences. While recognizing that class instructors have the final say in their syllabi regarding attendance policies, the APC requests that the Faculty Senate approve these recommended guidelines as a step toward reconciling the need for students to do their class work while also taking part in extra-curricular activities.

With me here to answer questions as necessary are Mary Lu Gribschaw and Anne Jorgensen from Athletics. Jim Slowiak was going to be here but his department is having a candidate on campus today and he was going to talk about the importance of this in the arts. Also Tim Matney who is on the APC and can also help answer questions in this regard.”

Chair Fenwick asked for discussion, since the motion came from committee and needs no second. Senator Bohland indicated he really appreciates the work the Academic Policies Committee has done on this. As a very active student he understands how difficult it can be to balance a schedule. His primary concern was that under the definition that was provided in the first paragraph his involvement in the Senate would not be covered under the policy. He then moved to **amend the last sentence to read “performance in athletic events, or for student leadership activities.”** Senator Norfolk seconded the amendment.

Chair Fenwick clarified the amendment for the Senate: “Add the clause ‘for student leadership activities’ to the sentence in the middle of that first paragraph. “These might include academic field trips, participation in concert performance or athletic events or student leadership and participation in university disciplinary hearings.” There being no discussion, the amendment passed and the Senate returned to discussion of the main motion.

Senator Matney rose to speak in favor of the motion. “Having sat through many hours of meetings discussing the motion, enjoyable hours, one of the things that the committee especially worked on was making sure we weren’t going to unduly impact the faculty. This actually went through a number of revisions so that the faculty didn’t feel like they had an extra burden to take on, and I think we’ve reached a pretty good balance on this. You have to meet with faculty with students at the beginning of the term to discuss problems but that’s probably good policy in any case. I think this is a reasonable good draft for the streamlined procedure which will help solve the problems at the end of the semester like those we might be experiencing now which for some students have not told us before what’s happening, now all the sudden are looking for some accommodations when it would be much better to do it beforehand. That’s the point of the motion.”

There being no further discussion, **the motion passed.**

Chair Fenwick invited Senator Sterns to report for Facilities Planning

d. Ad hoc Facilities Planning Committee report

Senator Sterns: “Just a brief report from the ad hoc Facilities Planning committee. Because of the schedule of the committee members we will actually be having our next meeting on May 10th and it is a tradition of this committee to continue to meet during the summer so that we are able to interact with the planning department. Already the second part of my report was just going to mention briefly the Parking Task Force. The group is working very hard and deliberately and we’ve had a lot of careful internal discussion. I think I’m doing my best to convey to the committee the faculty wishes, but I don’t think I have been as vocal or direct as Dr. Gerlach in reference to representing faculty. We’ve been dealing with issues of how to organize different levels of parking and various other things that would be premature for me to report in detail until the discussion is finished but I must say the committee is working very hard and I know that Dr. Case is doing everything in his darndest to bring us through this. So give us a chance and we’ll try to come up with something that will be reasonable.”

There were no questions for Senator Sterns. Chair Fenwick reported that there were written reports only from the Curriculum Committee and the Graduate Research Committee. He indicated the Student Affairs Committee requested time for a brief oral report. There were no objections so he invited Senator Gamble to give the report.

e. Student Affairs Committee report – (see Appendix I)

Senator Gamble: “A couple of months ago we were charged with looking at the Greek Affairs put in a fine system for the fraternities who had not handed in their paperwork on time. And so we were charged to look at where do we stand as far as the Senate by-laws. I did meet with Thad Doyle who is the head of Greek Affairs and talked with him. First of all he wanted to say and have me pass on to you that he was thrilled to see that the Senate was interested in Greek Affairs and he welcomed them to be more involved and he would love for them to be more involved also. So anyways, I did make up a report a couple of months ago. The report indicated that I did meet with Thad and looked over what had happened as far as the situation with the fine. Briefly, Greek Affairs said we need to do something for the fraternities and sororities who are not handing in their paperwork in on time to Student Affairs cause fraternities and sororities are saying hey we’re handing in ours on time, how come they keep being able to hand theirs in late? So when they were on a retreat, they decided to discuss this. Out of the twenty-two organizations, twenty-one presidents showed up one did not. It was agreed upon by the presidents that they would impose a fine. Therefore they sent out e-mails, they would tell them don’t forget this you know, lots of options to let them know this is what was going to happen. When this did come out after they had sent out letters and stuff, it was the fraternity that did not show up, Lonestar, that stated that this was not fair and that we did not go through Senate by-laws. So it was at that point when we needed to look at this more closely. After meeting with Thad Doyle and hearing exactly how they had gone through the different steps, talking to Denine Rocco and her giving her consent to say that this was fine, she then proceeded to put this fine in effect. So after talking with them we also had a meeting last week and stated what we needed to go forward with this. We decided to meet with the General Counsel and see what they had to say. I just got a report back from them yesterday or the day before stating that as curricular

activities under the one by-law, they did need to go through the Senate by-laws. But what we also found out is there is very few who even seem to know about this by-law existing. And so not only do we need to look at this for Greek Affairs, we need to be also looking at for all the other extracurricular affairs and how they are being notified that this is being done. So what we are proposing to do at this point is we feel that we need to be discussing a little bit more with Greek Affairs, we need to be meeting with Denine Rocco to discuss these Senate by-laws and how is this going to be enforced and how the extracurricular activities going to be aware that this does exist and what we are hoping to make a proposition to vote on in the fall, cause we don't want to rush it, we want to make sure we have all our ducks in a row. Or we may, if we get everything at this point we get everything finished we need to, we may take this to the Executive Committee over the summer. That's pretty much where we're at."

Being no questions for Senator Gamble, Chair Fenwick thanked her and the Senate moved onto New Business.

IV. New Business –

The first item of New Business was approval of the candidates graduating over for the summer, the list was circulating. Senator Norfolk **moved to approve the candidates for the summer** and Senator Sterns provided the second. There was no discussion. **The motion carried and the list was approved.**

Chair Fenwick: "Now we move on to our new legislative liason, John Allison. He comes to us to brief us on underlying issues with the State; he is the person most connected between our university and what the state legislature is doing. Before he joined our university he has served as Chief of Staff for Governor Taft in his last term, I believe, was with him also as Secretary of State. He runs a consulting business, The Allison Group out of Columbus Ohio. So, John Allison welcome to the Senate.

John Allison: "Good afternoon Mr. Chairman, Senators, I appreciate the opportunity to come and visit with you. I will start off by making the same offer to you that I made when President Bohland was kind enough to have me visit with student government about a month ago and that is I'm willing to do this as much as you think it's valuable and willing to interact with you to update you, come to your meetings, answer your e-mails, as Kyle knows I will do that in a timely fashion. I think it's important that you try to understand what we're trying to do on your behalf in Columbus and Washington and that's the deal that I've put on the table for you. So I hope that this will not be our only interaction, I'm more than happy to come back when it's productive to do so.

As the Chairman indicated, I have been retained as of January to serve as Governor's Affairs Counsel for the university. The best way to describe it is the President has asked me to quarterback the University's stake in federal government relations work. So far it's been a great challenge and it's good to be up here, I'm up here usually two days a week and then Columbus the balance, I still live in Columbus and I've enjoyed learning a lot about this fine institution and certainly have enjoyed how much nicer it looks every week when I come up here now that spring's finally arrived. I think,

for a change, it's an exciting time for higher education in Columbus right now. First, at the beginning of the year, we saw with respect to the governance of the Board of Regents, the Speaker of the House and Governor Strickland coming together and proposing significant changes to the governance structure. The proposal to have the Chancellor be a direct appointee of the Governor rather than an appointee of the regents, who serves at the pleasure of the Governor and to serve in the Governor's Cabinet. As of yesterday that bill made it to the second house. It passed the Senate yesterday unanimously with strong bipartisan support, as seems to be the flavor of the day in Columbus right now. And we think that bill will likely get to the Governor's desk for signature within the next two weeks and Chancellor Fingerhut who was appointed on an interim basis by the current regents to serve as Chancellor will then go through a different process under the new law he will be appointed Chancellor by Governor Strickland; he'll be approved by the Senate; and he will be official and secure under the new law. Dr. Proenza and the presidents in IUC supported the change in the law and we will keep our fingers crossed that Chancellor Fingerhut will be able to work with the Governor and the legislature and all of us in higher education to move things forward.

The majority of my time in Columbus right now is spent in watching our interests in the state budget debate. And those interests really fall into two categories; the first is to be mindful of the specific line item earmarks that the university enjoys, almost all of which the Governor recommended flat funding for. There was some additional funding that was recommended for Bliss and two other like institutions. We haven't been successful so far in sustaining the additional funding that was recommended for Bliss but with Dr. Brooks help we will have some better footing in the Senate. We'll keep our fingers crossed. Of course the larger piece that were watching is what will the legislature and the Governor do with the more general issue of state funding for higher education. You've all been through this, I was here earlier and know from hearing about the last meetings you know the contours of the compact that Governor Strickland proposed we're put on the table at an earlier meeting. I will just for purposes of putting it into context with what the House has now done, remind you that the Governor proposed a compact with really three elements; the first element was the element of tuition control of course we have a variety of budgets in this and the tuition caps that were proposed by the Governor were a freeze, a zero percent in the first year of the biennium and a no more than three percent the second year. The Governor also proposed increases in the state subsidy for a five percent increase in the first year of the biennium, two percent the second year and third part of the proposed compact that the Governor put on the table was efficiency savings. Which we still haven't had defined, but is the concept of efficiency savings, if institutions were going to freeze tuition along with the caps and get the state's subsidy funding you would also have to show in the first year of the biennium a one percent efficiency savings and then a three percent in the second year.

The House of Representatives in the last two weeks has significantly changed the equation and you probably saw the House unanimously passed their version of the state budget on Tuesday of this week. They did away with the compact, sort of. And what they have passed and has now gone over to the Senate this week are tuition caps of no more than three percent in the first year, zero in the second, state subsidy increase of two percent this next year and ten percent in the second year and that's guaranteed, not running it through the formula, that's guaranteed for each institution. They took out the language on mandated efficiencies and another piece of what the House did was to

create a new 100 million dollar STEM scholarship program that is not yet defined, other than we know a hundred million dollars has been set aside. That's a hundred million dollars for the biennium, not a \$100 million per fiscal year: a total of 100 million dollars for the biennium. We anticipate two other bills in the Senate and then in conference committee in June that scholarship program will be further defined. So we now see the bill going to the Senate and we are working now to get our set strategy in order working with IUC. There's an IUC president's meeting next week where they will hopefully come together and come to some consensus around a Senate strategy. From my perspective the first principle of dealing with the Senate is to do no harm because we've had progress here with what the Governor's proposed, what the House has proposed and we certainly don't want the Senate to take steps backwards.

I think we need to be mindful of the fact that there will be a desire, a temptation to freeze tuition for both years of the biennium. If that happens clearly the colleges and universities will be clamoring to make sure that the legislature pays for that, that there is a tradeoff. We also know that in the Senate there's also some talk about some kind of quality based incentive program that would be funded by some additional money above and beyond what the House has proposed and defining quality in higher education will be a difficult thing. It's a very subjective exercise but we know that there's some talk of creating quality based incentive program.

And so that's where we are, it's an interesting time for higher education in Columbus. The debate has changed. I don't think that I certainly would have thought in January that with a new Governor and legislature controlled by the other party that we would be sitting here in early May watching the legislature and the Governor having a bidding war over who can put more money into higher education. But that's what's happened. And I think that there's an opportunity here. I would not be surprised to see if the Senate upped the ante. The debate has changed for the positive, where before from my perspective and my prior experiences, particularly the legislature had a bad attitude about higher ed. They liked to make decisions about funding based upon anecdotes, based upon which institution flew their president around on an airplane or a story about Karen Holbrook at Ohio State traveling to Cleveland and being escorted around Cleveland in limousine. Those kinds of anecdotes were slowly eroding credibility. We have found a way now to move beyond that and instead of talking about those kinds of anecdotes, the rhetoric coming out of all through the leaders in Columbus, Republicans and Democrats is the relevancy of higher education to the economic development of the future of the state.

So it's a positive time although we should never rest on our laurels. I have for you today, as you see fit to distribute, some information that the President and the Trustees sent into the House of Representatives before they voted on the bill last week. I brought you a copy of a statement that the President made available to the media and a letter that went from our Board of Trustees went into the legislature last week supporting the positive things that they are doing.

John LaGuardia, a good colleague and I had an opportunity to break bread with Dr. Fenwick week before last and he asked the question "what can we do? Is there anything you would suggest to do to be helpful here?" I would suggest a show of your support, a show of the fact that you want to acknowledge the positive momentum in the discussion in Columbus and encourage that that mo-

mentum build, that the defining picture be supportive or even be improved between now and the time the Governor signs the bill on July 1. I think that that would be a very positive thing to do. I don't think there's any magic to it. I think between what the President said, what the Trustees said gives you the general flavor of the message and you can obviously use your own words as a body or individually help support that. And I think that's important and I think that Kyle that would certainly suggest that that would be a good thing for ASG to do as well. I think that the more voices that we're able to add to the pot are helpful and for a change there's an opportunity to be positive and to acknowledge and to use that positive energy to move this forward.

I'm going to switch over to another subject. Mr. Chair may I open this up to any questions about the budget?"

Chair Fenwick recognized Senator Norfolk and Senator Gehani.

Senator Norfolk: "We always hear about the magic efficiency savings that could be made. I know that the perception is that the universities waste money. But if you look at this year's budget as I have on several occasions, we spent about the same amount per student as the Cleveland Heights school system and they don't have to run the labs and other things that we do. It's extremely efficient and it's one of the reasons the salaries are frozen. So you know if the politicians are looking for sound bites they might look up numbers instead of anecdotes."

Mr. Allison responded: "I think that's very fair, it's a very fair point. I would add that the President's mantra on this is if you look at the cost of providing higher education in the state of Ohio, on average we are at or below the national average. And not out of line. And I think slowly those facts are creeping into the debate in Columbus. Very good point."

Senator Gehani: "I'm from the College of Business. Yesterday we had our meeting and there was some confusion about the funding for Global Business Institute. We used to have a line item. I think as the world is globalizing and becoming flatter and flatter, there should be all the more reasons for supporting that initiative rather than taking it out. Are you aware of what the position is on that now on that line item?"

John Allison: "Senator I am aware of that, as a matter of fact, we arranged for Dr. Hausknecht to come down to testify about four weeks ago in front of the House subcommittee on higher education. He did a very good job of defending the line item, answering questions. The Governor proposed flat funding for that line and the House kept that funding at that level."

Senator Gehani: "And that matter is settled now?"

John Allison: "We will continue to support that line through the Senate and through the conference committee. I'll tell you that the House has always been the greater challenge and I consider a minor victory along the road that we were able to save the funding for that line. It's good news."

There being no further questions for Mr. Allison on the budget, he moved onto other issues.

John Allison: “If I may, just two more quick issues. I also want to let you know that I am staffing, well many people will have a piece of the staffing, but I am the along with the President staffing the Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration and Innovation Study Commission. And certainly we’re trying to be responsive to that commission. You probably know that was created last year, it includes five institutions in Ohio. The message I want to leave with you today in case it hadn’t been conveyed previously, is that this is a very important process from my perspective, as your government affairs representative in Columbus. If you listen to what the Chancellor says publicly, he’ll be at the City Club in Cleveland tomorrow and I’m sure he’ll talk about this and we’ll probably be able to read about this in the Plain Dealer or the ABJ on Saturday morning. The Chancellor, the Speaker of the House, the Governor, people who are relevant to our being in Columbus and we’re all paying great attention to what happens in this process. I can’t sit here and predict what will happen in that process, but the expectations are very high that something will be different about the way we deliver higher education in Northeast Ohio. I’m not sounding the alarm bell; I just want to make sure that this is on your radar screen. I think it’s important and I will tell the President this that it’s important as this comes together that this body be informed and updated about this. The group came into existence, they just had three meetings, their statutory deadline to come up with a report to the General Assembly is at the end of December and I know it’s the Chancellor’s expectation, because he’s told me and told anybody else who will listen, that he thinks that this report should be a blueprint to some legislative action for the next calendar year. So I throw that out there, once again not to ring any alarm bells, but this is an important process for some of the important policy makers in Columbus and to the extent that we can be connected with you my recommendation is that we remain connected.

One more thing if I may Mr. Chairman, I do want to acknowledge that about a week ago you asked me and John to consider a formal government affairs committee structure, as exists at Bowling Green was the example that you gave us. I have nothing new to report other than the fact that I have not yet had a chance to discuss this with the President. The Provost and I have 33.2 seconds to talk about it. I just wanted to acknowledge since you asked me about it and I wanted you to know that it is on my to-do list. Thank you.”

Chair Fenwick thanked Mr. Allison and ask if there were any other questions?

Senator Lyons: “I wondered if it would be possible to be slightly more specific about what alarm bells you are not ringing?”

John Allison: “I think for those who are paying attention to this thing, the alarm bells that come to mind for me are: you’ve got these five institutions and they all do different things, they all do similar things. Two of them have law schools, for a lot of folks in Columbus they immediately want to fall back into the old thinking of where is the duplication, how can we chop stuff out, why do we have two law schools. I think that a lot of the debate that I’ve heard in Columbus previously has been in that kind of nature. You know, why do have an English program at each school, just you know, English who needs it. But it’s been rather fairly shallow discussion and I have higher expectation for this commission. They have engaged Dr. Steve Portch, who has done some work here in Ohio and other states, former Chancellor of the system in Georgia, to come in and shepherd this

process. And I think that this will be more orderly from my perspective of what might otherwise be a pretty shallow discussion about what do we have there and what do we put on the chopping block because we think it makes sense from a purely political perspective.”

Senator Lenavitt: “With your experience with political climate in Columbus, would you be willing to share with us what you think the benefits are of having a Chancellor that is a cabinet appointment and could go as the term limits go. What are the benefits of having a Cabinet Chancellor as opposed to a permanent Chancellor for continuity reasons?”

John Allison: “Senator, the bill as the Senate passed it yesterday provided a five-year term for the Chancellor that could be without term limits so I think that there is a possibility for built-in continuity. Let me tell you about my experience in working for a Governor and working for a Board of Regents under a different system. And some of this may be specific to a Chancellor that I spent most of my time working with and that was Chancellor Chu. When the Governor doesn’t have a lot of control - as in the old system and there’s a layer between the Governor, his appointees, the regents - it’s been my experience that” ... “that will often times make the Governor reluctant to be bold about these issues because he or she doesn’t have a point person to go out there and manage those issues and people. To set a priority and then to be at the whim of the Board, even though they’re your appointees with all the dynamics of a board, I think that makes a Governor gun shy about showing leadership on higher education issues is that he or she should. That’s been my experience. I was always very frustrated with the regents; I thought that they were in large part unresponsive and unconnected to the institutions that they governed. I thought that they were politically tone deaf most of the time and you know. To a certain extent that’s fine there is the risk under this new system that you’re going to get somebody who is too political and does things that are too risky. But I think we have a Governor here who wants to leave his mark, who wants to make this a priority. And I think the fact that he was going to have to deal with a board of regents appointed by the previous Governor who he really didn’t have a relationship with was very very difficult for him to be able to focus on higher education, build an implementation plan and know that he had the right people there in place to make it happen. I don’t know I think I said this in the Vice President’s meeting that I visited this morning, I’m not sure that at the end of the day we won’t rue the day that this that we made this change in the law. It’s not that the legislature can’t reverse the law but I think in these circumstances where you have a Governor, who’s very positive about higher education, he’s picked the right person and this is a good mechanism for them to be able to get things done quickly at a time when we’re playing catch-up in this state.”

Senator Gehani: “Yes, I mean every time we hear about English classes at a university. You know corporate America talks about a PC on every table top, I think our President has made it very clear you don’t need a bathroom and a toilet in every house in that case. Isn’t that convincing enough to Ohio legislators that there are certain needs to stay competitive?”

John Allison: “Senator I think that your points are well taken. I think that we have turned the tide in Columbus away from some of that shallow thinking. I think that that message, I know it’s been an uphill battle but I think the counter drumbeat to that kind of thinking is coming, is sinking in.”

Chair Fenwick asked for other questions. There being none he thanked Mr. Allison. Mr. Allison agreed to keep the Senate informed of any changes. Chair Fenwick offered to convey any talking points to Ohio Faculty Council when it meets with Chancellor Fingerhut next Friday.

Chair Fenwick continued “I’ll pay attention to his [Chancellor Fingerhut’s] speech tomorrow at Cleveland State. Secondly, as you alluded to, we would like to adopt a new committee for the Senate and it’s going to be called the Professional Affairs Committee which covers all things professional including government affairs. So we will send out a copy of their bylaw description of this committee to the Senate and look it over and see if we want to go move in this direction. It would necessitate us linking with your office.”

Senator Zingale asked if Mr. Allison would share his email address.

Mr. Allison was glad to do so. It’s jallison@allison-group.com.

Senator Zingale thanked Mr. Allison.

Chair Fenwick thanked Mr. Allison and the Senate moved to the next item of business.

“The next item of new business is to continue the discussion on the University Council proposal. And I will begin that with a report last week the Senate Executive Committee sent out a two-way survey so it was drafted by the University Council Exploratory Committee. You have seen a copy of it before, but it was felt by both the University Council Exploratory Committee and by the Senate Executive Committee that we needed more discussion at the end of the March meeting people still felt uncertain and we felt like we had not gotten as far along in our discussion as we could. And so we sent out this two-way survey last week and I just want to report some of the basic statistical results. Fortunately or unfortunately enough there were so few people responding, seventeen of the fifty-six senators, thirty percent that I could calculate these statistics by hand. So, the survey asked to evaluate the mission of the University Council stated in this statement, the various committees, strategic planning, wellbeing, recruitment/retention, graduation, information technology, finance/budget, facilities planning, communications and the executive committee, along with the overall committee structure and then to evaluate the overall proposal.

As far as the mission and the committees, there was very little variation in kind of the overall mean level of support. It ranged between neutral and supportive. If the number four is for support and three is neutral, the means came out between 3.4 for IT, and 3.8 for facilities planning. So again within that range of somewhere between neutral and supportive. The overall mean on approving the proposal as this draft was written was somewhat lower, a 3.1, which is neutral. The modal response to all of the items asked was supportive, not high support but supportive, four of the five. And this skewed down a ways by three and four people who responded with all ones, strongly opposed. And one, this is my sociology in me, taken qualitative comments and coding them, but one person responded not to each committee by rating them but in each comment field said “forget this proposal” “forget this proposal” “forget this proposal”, so I figured in each case that was strongly opposed so I noted it as one.

As far as representation models, there was no one representation model that was more favorable. And about half of the respondents did not enter any data into that at all, could not compare those. So that's a report from the qualitative side I know if the Senate would allow Dr. Erickson, whose the other representative on the exploratory committee from the faculty would like to talk about some of the qualitative comments that people wrote back."

Dr. Erickson: "All of you had a chance to look at this right because they sent it out by e-mail. I looked at the comments for the items. Because there were not very many responses it was easy to look. Of course not everybody who responded actually put a comment in. I hope that all of you had a chance to look at it. I'm not going to read it all out to you....It's a very busy week to do this kind of thing...Here's how I understood what was being said. And this is funny for me because Rudy and I were talking about it before, I'm the economist who's supposed to be doing quantitative and he's doing qualitative so I may be quite wrong. But this is based on my understanding of what people were trying to say as best I understood it. At best you're neutral about the idea. Partly because you're not sure what the heck it is, and partly because well, who knows. You seem to feel that faculty should have a greater input than set out in the present proposal. You didn't vote on the particular weighting of the representation, [so these comments pertain to] the executive committee level and university council level where each constituency has exactly the same representation. And then you cancel all those different combinations. And I'm interpreting that blank on those as none of those [alternatives] really [have] sufficient faculty input.

At the committee level, where the representations weren't mentioned, I would say you probably are saying you also want to make sure that you have really significant faculty input into that. Let's see we've got all the committees, I'll remind you what they are; IT, strategic planning, recruitment and retention, graduation, information, financial and budgeting and communications. You want significant faculty, a majority is what I expect we would like, into each of those. Again looking at the comments [in the historical context which I have given you before – before 2003 when faculty] had by far the largest proportion in PBC, Planning and Budgeting Committee and also a significant proportion of those on Facilities Planning. We know that of course we've not had input into those areas since 2003 but you're suspicious that the present proposal doesn't provide an effective replacement.

You're also doubtful that the proposed structure will not have significant input into governance in the areas related to the committees. I'm quoting from one of the comments "it needs to be seen to be important to the administration, trustees and constituents that's taken from a comment without having major input that is listened to and taken seriously there is no point in setting up the system." You're also concerned about the role of the Senate and the material outlines are significant input by the Senate and faculty into the significant academic issues, or how faculty can provide feedback to the representatives on University Council.

That's my reading of the comments. I am open to [other interpretations] and if I left something else out here I want you to add to it. But I see is as how you feel. This is a really useful feedback because it strengthens the position of the Senate faculty representatives our continuing discussion of this whole idea. It's still just a proposal; this was the first draft of a proposal. This feedback is what we

can use further, we, Rudy and I can say that we're not just speaking for ourselves or what we think people say but that would give us some credibility in representing at least the Senate. And our job is of course to take that feedback back and continue with that kind of discussion, negotiation whatever you want to call it, over the summer and then get back to you in September to see what the response is to what you've said. So..."

Senator Kushner Benson: "I'm a little concerned about how we take these data and reach broader generalizations. A response rate of thirty percent with the overall response and then the comments which you indicated were from a smaller number is really disturbing.... It's just such a small limited group. Because the other side is then to say if thirty percent say this and a smaller percentage provide the comments, what does the larger body feel? And to assume that it just because we're all too busy of course is one assumption but the other assumption could be that these people feel distinctly different or they don't care. So I think we have to be really cautious and I personally would not be comfortable using those data to do anything with because it is such a small sample and there are no indication that the data are at all representative."

Dr. Erickson: "I understand what you are saying and I perfectly understand the position. Other ways of using this is to say okay, this is one way of looking at it. Let's get other feedback, that's one way to get feedback which is exactly what you're saying. I think that the fact that people didn't decide wasn't because they were busy but because at least I think one thing would be at best they're neutral. Because they haven't got any, they weren't giving any opinion at all."

Senator Kushner Benson responded that she would suggest the responses are too few to make any kind of a generalization.

Senator Norfolk: "Well I, what I know about sampling, I would not even make generalizations. I wouldn't make any conclusion at all. I would throw the results out. You have seventeen responses. The percentage doesn't even matter, seventeen people is not a sample of anything."

Chair Fenwick asked if the survey should be re-administered.

Dr. Erickson responded she did not think so. She thought it was important to recognize that the survey came out after the March meeting, in which senators were asked to talk to their constituents. She hoped that the seventeen responses had more weight than a random sample of people on-campus, since she expected that these responses were representative of their larger constituencies. She understood the issue of low response rates and had no problem with other's comments. However, she understood that surveys often had response rates lower than this.

Senator Bohland: "Well I'd just like to make a comment that we've sent the survey two times now so I'm not sure if it's the University Council failing or if it's this body failing the University Council. So I don't want to just put the brakes on everything just because I think that the body has failed the Executive committee and the University Council Exploratory Committee. I mean you just can't

halt work through the entire summer just because we only have some feedback. I don't see a problem with continually getting feedback and processing over the summer but to say scrap these results and start over I think is a little rash.

The other thing is we have on this committee elected representatives from every constituent so those are the people representing myself, students, Dr. Fenwick and Dr. Erickson, faculty and they're supposed to bring the voices of those constituent bodies to the group. So just because we don't have more than a thirty percent response rate, doesn't mean that the faculty isn't well represented on the committee."

Senator Sterns: "Well, occasionally in my life I've had to make pronouncements unconstrained by data. So I think that that's something that we won't venture into, but I there a couple of reasons why I think the response has been low. One is, it's not really clear what the body is until you know where representation is. So the difference in the areas of representation give different interpretations of what the body might be like. I think the second thing is that some of us are reticent because we don't fully understand the relationship with the existing Faculty Senate and this new body and how business will be done. And so I think there are some ambiguities here which need perhaps be further explored and another approach to doing research is if you don't get a decent sample the first time you try again. So that's another approach we could collect the data again with a stern, no pun intended, warning about the importance of participation. But I think for me I find it very hard to judge what was happening here until I knew how the body is going to be put together."

Senator Gandee: "I want to ask the same question I asked a few months back. Looking at the essence of what happens is at the corporate bargaining table. What is the function of this UC in relationship to the bargaining agreement among the faculty and the university?"

Chair Fenwick asked Senator Cheung if he would respond.

Senator Cheung rose to respond. "I would like to try... The collective bargaining process deals principally with wages, hours and working conditions. Now working conditions in our environment might be somewhat broadly construed but nonetheless, the scope of the collective bargaining process is much much narrower than the scope that this body encompasses. This body is, as I have said before, the collective conscience and voice of the faculty. No union can ever claim that role in the same way that this body can, because of its elected nature. And if my colleagues in AAUP wish to string me up or better yet fire me, for comments such as that so be it. But having stood where Rudy is standing, I have a unique perspective on the power that this body's voice carries and ought to carry. And so I think that it's very important that first of all we not ever ever underestimate the power of this body no matter what structure anybody chooses for this university council. Because come what may, we will remain the voice of the faculty. I think that was a longer answer than you were looking for senator, but hopefully I've provided some insight."

Senator Kushner Benson: "I think this was at [the March meeting], but I seem to recall very rich conversation in which a lot of very basic questions were proposed, what would be the relationship between this committee and Faculty Senate, are we actually proposing eliminating Faculty Senate

and so forth. And I do recall the conversation went quite well after five, with the conversation being why does such a substantive topic come at the end of the meeting with the discussion of possibly putting it at the beginning of the meeting on the agenda. And I also seem to recall it might have been last year, when we had a special Senate meeting to discuss that was, probably Senator Erickson would recall the exact date we did that.”

Chair Fenwick interjected: “September 15th. September 15th for the last every four years we’ve met the third week of September for benefits.”

Senator Kushner Benson continued: “So we did have a special Senate meeting where we devoted that entire meeting to that topic and it was a very passionate conversation. So that might be a mechanism and then what happens is we talk about it and then we leave and we come back in a month and I don’t know about you but between what thing and the other there’s so many other things that go on that the immediacy of it, the richness of the conversation is lost. From a data collection perspective the one way to get a large representative response rate is to collect data in a face-to-face situation. So I would suggest we have a special meeting of the Senate in which we talk about all of these issues and then administer the survey at the end of the conversation when many of these topics are fresh in our mind and we’re better able to express our opinion.”

Senator Gerlach: “Mr. Chairman, I’ve become quite weary of this whole topic. And we’re going nowhere with it. Remember, I think it was last meeting or so, Senator Norfolk said his faculty had no interest in this business at all. I was talking to ex-colleague in the History department and they haven’t been apprised of any of this either. I’ll tell you our retirees group insofar as we were able to explain the proposal thought it was an utter waste of time. And I’m going to repeat what I said once before, if you’re going to settle this question of how the Senate will stand over and against the Council get us a new draft of the Senate by-laws. To lay out exactly what its powers will be, what committees it will have and then you can contrast that with the others rules that you have for the University Council. But you haven’t done that yet. And I don’t know how long we’re going to drag this thing out. Month after month after month, waiting for surveys to be completed and so on. I just don’t think you’ve got a very good response at all so far to give any encouragement. I don’t know whether I should venture this motion or not. Just test the metal of the house today. Why not? I move that this proposal for University Council be postponed indefinitely.”

Chair Fenwick: “Okay, it’s been seconded. Is there any discussion on the postponement indefinitely?”

Senator Kushner Benson: “I have a question and I’m not sure that it’s a question that’s appropriate with that kind of motion. Could you refresh my memory, was the Senate asked to consider a different governance structure?”

Chair Fenwick: “Yes, it set up the committee, to elect representatives to university...”

Dr. Erickson responded that “changing a major governance structures takes a long time.” The last time we did this, changing from the old University Council to the Faculty Senate took a very long

time. “This particular proposal started with [a joint effort by] the Senate and administration to look at all of the umpteen committees on campus, of which there were umpteen ad hoc committees that nobody seems to know about. Was that not right Mike ‘because that goes back to when you...”

Senator Cheung agreed that is where it began.

Dr. Erickson continued: “You had just stepped down as Chair of the Senate and you were asked at the very beginning to be one of the Chairs. So they went off and they collected all the information and then finally it took them several years. Senator Norfolk was on that committee, and it took a long time didn’t it? And [their] report said boy we’ve got a problem with governance. With that report came a mile like this of literature for us to read and so the Faculty Senate Executive Committee took that report and said right, let’s do an ad hoc committee to study and see the whole issue on decision making. Which we did over a summer with realistic, all this stuff, and the proposal, the general outline of the proposal that included a greater role of other constituencies but made sure that it was just not what we had been left with after 2003....Our ad hoc committee included many of the constituencies [but] had a majority of faculty on it and out of that came the suggestion of this general idea of having two bodies that each constituency should be represented on constituency issues by their own body and that this for the ones that were across the whole university that there be some format.

Me, I thought it was University Senate but it became University Council. It’s harder for us because we go back to the days when that was a different body. That is the one that we brought to the Senate. [It is] a long report, you’ve had a lot of time to read it, and you’ve got a resolution in the Senate was that we should go ahead and get the EC to come up with representatives to explore this idea and that’s what we’ve done over the fall and into now. It came out of the Senate. We had to then go and get the other constituencies, because they’re not represented and get them involved in it and that’s where this came about. Does that make sense? I do understand this business of waiting til the end of the meeting, I, the frustration is mine as well.”

Senator Stachowiak: “I’ll make this short; I’ve got to pick up my kids. Shared leadership is not proposing to indefinitely postpone a committee that was brought out by this institution. You guys are the ones who said we need to look at shared governance, shared leadership. You all said it needs to be done because of the fact that we have decision making so diverse across campus that it can’t be managed. So we need an institution that can bring everybody together to the same table and talk about all this. And instead now what we’re doing is sitting here arguing about little things and finally saying well we’re just going to postpone it indefinitely and do nothing about it. I’m sorry but that’s ostrich head in the sand type mentality and that’s not leadership. That’s just us saying we’re not going to deal with because we don’t understand it and we can’t handle it and I’m sorry but I didn’t get up at 6:30 in the morning and spend weeks going to these meetings just to sit there and say waste of time. I’m sure you didn’t do the same thing on Decision Making Task Force. And read literature like this. What’s the use if we’re just gonna sit there and say well what we’ve got now works fine. Who cares if the review and accreditation committee and says well you’re not doing anything maybe we shouldn’t approve your accreditation for the first time since 1914. I think that there’s some problems here and we can’t just sit and say that they’re going to go away. We need to

look at it and if you don't understand what's going on then that's the fault of the UC committee that didn't come back and explain it to you correctly. And then you need to ask them for more information and get the explanation of how we proceed the information flow and what the rights of the Senate are and what the rights of University Council are and what the rights of SEAC and CPAC and all the other institutions that are still going to maintain their individuality and responsibilities and maybe get the purity that some people look for. But that's not to say that this is not something we should move forward on, that we should postpone indefinitely. That makes no sense to me whatsoever. And with that I have to run."

Chair Fenwick: "Let me just make a ruling of motion, I'm going to rule it out of order because there is no motion on the floor. And the motion to postpone indefinitely is a motion regarding the motion on the floor and there is no motion on the floor."

Senator Gerlach: "A proposal has been made to the Senate, we're discussing it by moving as though we're adopting something, there's no..."

Chair Fenwick: "There's no proposal on the floor to adopt this motion, there never has been a motion on the floor, if you want to do away with the Senate participation in the UC you'd have to make a motion to rescind the Senate's representation on that committee."

Senator Gerlach: "It is a very peculiar interpretation of Robert's Rules..."

Chair Fenwick: "Give me a parliamentarian and I will.... Senator Cheung was next and then Senator Bohland."

Senator Cheung: "I'm not quite sure what I was speaking to now. I know that from a parliamentary standpoint Senator Norfolk, I was going to rise in opposition to my colleague's motion. I guess I will share the rationale under the rubric of our having the discussion on the topic. In Engineering, particularly Thermodynamics there are state functions and path functions. And a state function would be our path leading into this building a path function would be how many calories we burn getting here, that number would be different for each of us, even though we're all here in the same place. If this were a state function, that is we were trying to evaluate what is the best governance for The University of Akron, I think the discussion would go one way. It is not. We got here via a path. That path included some rather cataclysmic events: the election of a union, the withdrawing of certain functions from this body. I would choose the words in retribution; one could argue that, retribution by the Board of Trustees, I don't want to quibble over that actually it's not important. But we got here through a very tortuous and rather ugly path. And I think one of the functions of this body should be to put that past behind us and frankly one positive thing that could come out of any half-way reasonable formation of a university council, as much as I shudder at that term having served upon the last one, that's alright. Would be to pardon the phrase, sanitize that past and give us a new beginning as a faculty in terms of having an influence over such things as planning and budgeting and having a more direct influence over such things as facilities planning. Albeit, you might call it diluted from our glorious past, frankly that glorious past is not as glorious as some may recall it. Our recommendations were in fact just that; were often ignored. I think we need to find a

way around this history and frankly attempted to resurrect the planning and budgeting committee and the campus facilities planning committee in anything resembling their past form will not get past the Board of Trustees. I just don't foresee that. And going that route is just a banging our heads against the wall. If we get past this, what we get back is the ability for us as a body to look at the budget and say in our view as the academicians on this campus it is deficient by a, b, c and d by resolution. And what can they do? We have a resolution instead of a recommendation that is a distinction without a difference quite frankly. And will they turn around and say that's not academic enough we dissolve you? That would read well. No, I think we regain some power that we lost in that collision. And so I would urge us to find a reasonable compromise and get this darn thing done. And move on."

Senator Bohland: "I had two points; Senator Stachowiak took the first one and then you took the second one, so I'll address a third one. I would just like to make a suggestion since we're at the last Senate meeting at five o'clock and I was supposed to leave five minutes ago that we take all this feedback that we could have got this semester and are starting to get now and continue to build this feedback and these questions for the summer and start our committee working through the summer addressing these questions and concerns and suggestions and then start back at the first Senate meeting in the fall with a new discussion like Senator Cheung was talking about and with a new document all this hopefully will be resolved. My concern is that we table this now, we come back in the fall and we're at the same place. I just don't want to waste the three months that we have to addressing these concerns, these suggestions and the questions. And so we work through the summer to do that and get as much as we can and then continue to do that at the beginning of next fall. Not an official motion but a suggestion."

Senator Matney: "I'd like to first of all acknowledge the time and energy the committee's put into this. It is a lot of work and work that was done in earnest and with the best of intentions of the university in mind. Having said that I think we also have to consider the possibility that after six months of work we've come up with an idea that isn't any good. I'm not saying it is or isn't I'm saying that we should consider the possibility. I'm sure we've all written a few articles that never got past our desk and sometimes you have a great idea that just doesn't pan out. The problem to my mind with this whole thing is, I don't see any point in considering or continuing the discussion of what we want Faculty Senate to look like until we know whether there's any support from the administration. I've been sitting here for six months, my colleagues when I talk to them about this issue said does the administration support this? And I had to say I don't know they haven't addressed it yet. Never heard of it. Strong support says yes but it comes through something resembling this. We have a flow chart that doesn't involve the President until the very next to the last box. If he doesn't support it, what's the use? Once again I think I would request or this body should request that the President specifically address the support specifically is for this specific plan as it stands. With the understanding it may change, that would be great, right now I can't get people interested because right now it's just a few people; it's just us talking about it. It's not anything that has substance in their minds. So maybe I've missed part of the conversation."

Senator Gerlach: "Mr. Chairman. Before we conclude I simply want to rise and register my protest to the ruling of the Chair. The purpose of the motion to postpone anything indefinitely is to suppress

action. I propose that we suppress the action and the discussion of this on and on. That is subject to a reasonable vote. I'm sorry that the Chair disagreed with me, but I'm not going to go through further complications and appeal the Chair. But I think it's time for us to get on with this, perhaps we should take the advice of the young senator about to leave and agree that this discussion here today will cease and we may wait until the fall to take it up again. And drag it out and drag it out. Is a motion in order that we may proceed on that basis now?"

Chair Fenwick indicated a motion to adjourn the meeting would end discussion. However, Senator Gerlach did not want to make such a motion, as he had other points to raise for the good of the order. So the senate returned to Senator Matney's point about the administration and asked if the Provost wished to address it.

Provost Stroble: "I think that we will include the President in the body of Vice Presidents as we finish up our feedback and that the models built on getting feedback now and I acknowledge that Council of Deans, of which I'm a member and Vice Presidents which is really how the President interacts, we know we need to fully engage and provide meaningful feedback that would certainly be an indicator of what our thinking is about the proposal under review. I think that's different than a thumbs up, thumbs down and actually more meaningful. And we will accomplish that."

Chair Fenwick: "Senator Matney does that address your issue. Other constituencies, the Vice Presidents, The Council of Deans that are having the same kind of issues that this body is having, understanding. And I think what we're hearing today is maybe a way of concluding for now what we are doing. What I hear is what we need to specifically address what we're doing with the university council proposal in relationship to the by-laws of the Senate, what would the new by-laws or the new Faculty Senate or Academic Senate look like and that's certainly something that we can address specifically over the summer. Senator Kushner Benson's point about having a special meeting, I think absolutely we need that. To try to work out this meeting there simply was no time because of other commitments."

Dr. Erickson: "Could we make it, I suggest there is that beautiful mid-September day that we always seem to meet on, we did it on wellbeing, then let's do it on this one. It is after all the beginning of the semester. The first meeting of the Senate is always taken with organization, so it would not make sense to have it then."

Chair Fenwick: "The first meeting they have to elect a new Chair, the most important thing from my point of view. So we will set a special meeting of the Senate on the third Thursday of September, 2007 to specifically discuss this proposal. Is there anything else that I need to hear?"

Senator Matney asked if it is a reasonable timeframe to allow the Council of Deans and the council of Vice Presidents to provide their feedback by then so the Senate would have this information at the meeting.

Provost Stroble: "It will be done well before then. And it will go to the University Council Exploratory Committee which is our vehicle for giving our feedback just as every other constituency

including Faculty Senate routes their feedback back through that body. So the University Council exploratory committee in my view will need to help frame how they wish to get feedback that helps get this into an action item. Because it's not ready to be an action item but it's going to get there, we really have to have feedback to get it done and yes we will accomplish that."

Senator Matney: "Mr. Chairman, can we make sure that those documents are available well before the Faculty Senate meeting?"

Chair Fenwick assured the senators that as soon as the information is available it will be distributed to the Faculty on the listserve.

Senator Kushner Benson: "Well one thing since we're going through a transition time, sending it out to current faculty senate list, is going to hit people like myself who are leaving the Senate and not encompassing new members to the Senate, but I would also encourage at that special meeting that some form of data collection at that meeting of something strong whole and concrete, whatever."

Senator Hallett: "Every time that we get to this discussion we have long discussion about how this occurred, what went on and so on. And I just ask that the next time that we have this, I think that it's a very good point that we have one meeting where we discuss this topic and refrain from the history because history doesn't help us make a decision about whether or not this is a good idea or a bad idea and I would also like to reiterate what others said that we need a draft as you mentioned of the bylaws and what the role of the Senate would be before we have any vote and we need a discussion of what the proposal would provide and the input and the people who would be involved and not about the history because the history doesn't help us make a decision about whether or not we think this is a good idea."

Senator Lyons: "Unfortunately I'm retiring so I won't be able to participate in this discussion yet again. Because I won't be here I want to make one suggestion as you all know on the listserve I articulated some pretty strong concerns about this proposal. In the course of the discussion however, I was persuaded that the one reason to consider the proposal is that possible new committees of this university council will be constituted in a way that will make them more likely to get information in a timely manner; to allow us to have input because the new committees will have less faculty on them frankly and more administrators. And I don't mean that in a bad way, that's one of the advantages of the new committees, they'll be more operational from the administration's perspective. And that is somewhat persuasive to me. That might mean functioning committees as opposed to what we have here which is something significantly less than functioning committees. So I want to just throw an idea out; if that is the benefit of university council, why not reconstitute the committees of the faculty Senate along similar lines. Recreate a PBC that has more administrative representation on it and less trouble-making representation on it."

Senator Cheung: "I'd like to change to the topic. Mr. Chairman I **move the Executive Committee be authorized to communicate on behalf of the Faculty Senate supporting the House and or Higher Education budgets if it sees fit to do so.**" Senator Norfolk provided the second. The **motion passed without discussion.**

Senator Gerlach rose for the good of the order. "Just a request, that when you send out the next agenda of a regular meeting that under Unfinished Business you'll be sure to itemize two things that we have to keep track of; one the questions that I asked to today of the administration concerning the benefits committee membership and the parking thing, and the second thing is we still are to hear somewhere down the line the proposed revision of the student disciplinary code for Senate actions....The Secretary told us in his report that this was still in the works and so we are expecting that somewhere down the line we will have to act on these are two items that particularly we need to keep track of."

VIII. Adjournment

Chair Fenwick thanked the senators and adjourned the meeting.

The meeting adjourned at 5:20 p.m.

Verbatim transcript prepared by Heather Loughney

*Transcript edited by Richard Stratton,
Secretary of the Senate*

APPENDICES TO MINUTES

FACULTY SENATE MEETING OF MAY 3, 2007

APPENDIX A

Secretary Report for Faculty Senate Meeting
May 3, 2007

On April 19, 2007 the Executive Committee met to set the agenda for today's meeting. We also met with the President and Provost to discuss the following issues.

Update on CFAA and Nursing discussions:

- The Provost indicated the discussions are continuing. She hopes to have a recommendation by the end of the semester. The potential outside partners (City of Akron, Summa, Akron General, and NEOUCOM) have agreed to meet in May to discuss potential opportunities.

Update on Northeast Ohio Universities Collaboration Commission:

- The commission is still in the early organizational stages; rumors of any potential action are premature. However, President Proenza provided his estimates of potential boundaries: consolidation into a single entity has been rejected as has a recommendation of no change.

Update on "Compact" and state budget; the status of OBR:

- Compact moving through legislature. A House bill is likely to be introduced soon, but when the Senate might consider it or the specific language is uncertain.
- The OBR restructure seems to be overshadowed by the budget process.

Update on any changes in Student Disciplinary Code:

- Candice Campbell Jackson reported no changes have occurred. Draft changes in the some student documents will hopefully be completed by the end of June. The Senate representatives (including Senator Bove) will be included in the process. No recommendations are scheduled for Board action in May.

Student Success as strategic initiative:

- There have been discussions of how the various Student Success recommendations will be coordinated with other initiatives.

University Council Proposal:

- The VPs, sensing some loss of momentum, are considering how they might facilitate the conversation.

University Park Alliance:

- There was a suggestion that an update on efforts of the University Park Alliance might be of interest to the Senate.

That concludes my report.

APPENDIX B

REPORT OF THE SENIOR VICE PRESIDENT AND PROVOST

FACULTY SENATE

May 3, 2007

A Call for Community

Reflections on the Virginia Tech community

April 24, 2007

Editor's note: President Luis Proenza asked Dr. Paul Levy — professor of industrial/organizational psychology, chair of the Department of Psychology and a graduate of Virginia Tech — to reflect on the events at his alma mater and what can be learned from them. His essay is below.

By Dr. Paul Levy (pelevy@uakron.edu)

Monday, April 16, was a very difficult day for many of us as we watched in shock and horror at the tragic events that took place at Virginia Tech in Blacksburg, Va. The events hit much too close to home for my family and me because my wife and I met while doing our graduate work at Tech in the 1980s. Virginia Tech is a wonderful university and Blacksburg is the quintessential college town. I don't think I've ever talked to anyone who did not enjoy their experiences at Tech – great school, great community, great people. We loved our five years there and left in 1989 for my job here at UA.

We have been back to Tech a few times in the last 15 years or so. Much has changed around campus and in Blacksburg, but the community is as strong as ever and all the qualities of the campus, university, town, and people that have made it a special place continue. A dark cloud moved into Blacksburg last Monday and that cloud will not easily nor quickly dissipate, but it will, and Virginia Tech will grow and thrive after it struggles to move beyond these horrific and senseless acts of violence. Tech and Blacksburg will be forever changed by the terrible tragedy last week, but it will also be changed by the growth and commitment of the students to their university, by the incredible support and loyalty from the community, and by the strength and resolve of a faculty that truly loves its university.

Obviously, students, faculty, and universities all over the country have been touched by these events. Many have questioned (perhaps led by 24/7 media coverage) how safe we are on college campuses. I think we are no more or less safe on college campuses than we are in grocery stores, libraries, highways or movie theaters. More importantly, I'm not sure that's the most essential question we need to address. Certainly, events like this one make us stand up and review our policies and reassure each other that we know how to handle potentially disastrous situations. However, the likelihood of this kind of thing happening at Akron or any other university is quite remote. These things don't happen every day and, fortunately, most of us will never have to deal directly and in such close proximity with what the folks in Blacksburg have had to deal with. I think the more important question is: Are each of us making contributions to our university community in ways similar to or different from the ways that we have heard so much about over the past week? The heroic efforts of many Tech students and faculty were revealed. People died or risked their lives to help others. Individuals showed an inordinate amount of courage to face the tragedy head on. Folks were not ashamed to share their emotions with others as an outward and visible sign of their love of others, their university, and their community. The "Virginia Tech Family" has shone brightly throughout this tragedy and its students have been the brightest of all. What happened to the Tech family was terrible and senseless. How they deal with this heartbreak is what will ultimately define them. I am seeing great strength from the Virginia Tech community now and I anticipate great things in the future.

I ask each member of our "Akron Family" to stand up and evaluate what contributions we're making to our community and to each other. I believe that how we deal with and react to those things that surprise us, excite us, educate us, and engage us is how we too will be ultimately defined. My prayers go out to my Tech brothers and sisters and especially to the families who have suffered such great losses. Meanwhile, my hopes and dreams are right here with my Akron family – hopes and dreams of strengthened relationships, loyal support, a common purpose, and meaningful contributions from each and every one of us to our University of Akron community.

Leadership Begins with You

- Lorraine R. Matusak, Author of *Finding Your Voice: Learning to Lead. . . Anywhere You Want to Make a Difference* on campus May 7th to meet ALF, Deans, VPs, Community Partners
- Academic Leadership Forum: Applications due May 11th
- Ohio Academic Leadership Academy: Applications due May 11th
- Shared Leadership Awards—News to come at May 4th Founders Day
- Transitions: A Toast to Thomas Dukes

A Few Updates and the Work to Come. . .

- UA Budget Priorities and the Budget Process
- Administrative Program Review (See handout)
- University Council Exploratory Committee Response from COD and VPs (See handout)
- Enrollment Management Roadmap and Fall Projections
- Searches Underway and Those to Come
- May 16th Meeting with Student Success and Retention Committee
- NCA Self-Study Committee

APPENDIX CAPPENDIX A**DRAFT**

Summary: Administrative Program Review
April 2007

Administrative Unit	Program Reviewed/Date	Results
Information Technology	Information Technology: Budget, Allocation of Course Fees, Strategic Directions, Reporting Structure, Levels of Service: 2005-06	OAC Reviewed carry-over funds; Restored 35/65% split in IT fees; Established strategic goals for IT; Revised reporting relationship for CIO; Recruited new CIO; Assessed Service Satisfaction; Launched Footprints software tracking 2008: Will repeat service satisfaction assessment
Administration and Finance	Review E.J. Thomas/Civic status: 2007	Ongoing
	Risk Management Audit: 2006-07	Ongoing
Student Affairs	Enrollment Management: 2006	Hired current AVP for Enrollment Management with charge derived from consultant's recommendations; Enrollment Management Roadmap created
	Center for Career Management: Functions, Impact, and Fees: 2007	Ongoing
	Recreation Center and Wellness Center:	Realignment and reduction in budget and

	Analysis of budget and staffing as part of budget transformation 2006 – 07	staffing.
Capital Planning and Facilities	Room Utilization Study: 2005-06 Room Scheduling Study: 2006-07	Revised room classifications to achieve more accurate reporting to OBR Installing software that will enable more accurate, online scheduling requests
Public Affairs and Development	Tuition Pricing Study: 2005 STAMATS Survey of Public Perception and Impact of Public Relations: Ongoing	Used results to assist in setting tuition/fees rate Used to revise advertising and UA documents
Research and Graduate School	Study of OBR Policies regarding subsidy and credit hour limits: 2004	UA enrollment policies that ensure alignment with OBR policies
Office of the President	NCAA Self-Study	Gender equity funding to achieve ongoing NCAA certification
Office of the Provost/COO	Operational Excellence Initiatives: 2006-07 Student Employee Processing; Blue, Gold, and Green; Conflict of Interest Reporting Operational Excellence Initiatives: 2007-08 Administrative/Faculty Search Processes Program Review: Spring 2006 – met with Deans and Outreach personnel in Colleges to discuss challenges for credit bearing outreach Early work of Engagement Council	Ongoing Revenue Sharing Plan Launched Engagement Council Barriers sub-committee Engagement Matrix sub-

	<p>2005-2006 Review of international education exchange</p> <p>First Year Experience The Foundations of Excellence Task Force Self Study completed in 2005 – 06</p> <p>Student Success and Retention Committee</p>	<p>committee</p> <p>Launched International Advisory Committee</p> <p>Received feedback from outside reviewers as each section completed and after completion of the final report. FYE Task Force prioritized recommendations. IR committee assessing various FY Initiatives as part of ongoing work.</p> <p>Have identified areas and work is ongoing.</p>
--	--	--

APPENDIX D

APPENDIX E

MOTION IN REGARD TO ESTABLISHING GUIDELINES FOR ABSENCE

DUE TO PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY-SPONSORED EVENTS

The Academic Policies Committee met and unanimously supported the establishment of a policy regarding student absences due to their participation in university-sponsored events.

Be it resolved that the policy Guidelines for Absence due to Participation in University Sponsored events be adopted.

Rationale: Because penalizing students for their absences due to their participation in university-sponsored events may undermine the student success that comes from an educational experience where curricular and co-curricular activities are complementary, the APC was asked to consider developing attendance guidelines for such student absences. While recognizing that class instructors have the final say in their syllabi regarding attendance policies, the APC requests that the Faculty Senate approve these recommended guidelines as a step toward reconciling the need for students to do their class work while also taking part in extra-curricular activities.

GUIDELINES FOR ABSENCE DUE TO PARTICIPATION IN UNIVERSITY SPONSORED EVENTS

Policy: Classes at The University of Akron are conducted on the premise that regular attendance is expected. However, certain university sponsored student activities and events may be recognized as legitimate reasons for absence from class. For the purposes of this policy statement, a university sponsored event means an event that is linked to an academic department, athletics (games, not practices), or an administrative requirement for the student involved (such as a disciplinary hearing). These might include academic field trips, participation in an approved concert, performance, or athletic event, and participation in a university disciplinary hearing. This policy explicitly does not cover absences due to illness or any cause other than participation in a university sponsored event. University sponsored events—from marching band to theatre, from soccer to engineering competitions—should be seen by all members of the campus community as an important part of a student’s university education.

Seek to encourage a spirit of faculty-student collaboration for student success in linking curricular and co-curricular activities. In this spirit, an effort should be made to treat university sponsored events as excusable absences, whenever possible not triggering grade-related penalties. At the same time, **the course syllabus is the final word on attendance and assignment completion for any given class**. Therefore, students are responsible for reading the syllabus closely to be certain that they understand, and are prepared to meet, the instructor’s expectations regarding attendance. To encourage collaboration for student success, the following guidelines are suggested for each party: sponsors, students, and instructors. The process begins with the sponsor’s and student’s responsibilities:

Event Sponsors shall:

1. Make every effort to prioritize class work when scheduling university sponsored events.
2. Provide to each instructor a list of all university sponsored events which might involve student absences from their class, including absences related to travel required for participation in the event. The list should be given to the instructor at or before the first scheduled class, activity, or field trip of the semester, or before the end of the second week of the semester, whichever occurs first. Once the faculty member signs the attached “Assignment Completion Form” and returns this list to the student (and the student returns it to the sponsor), all parties should be able to assume that accommodations will be made for those listed activities.

3. In cases where the date and time of the scheduled activity are not known within this time frame (e.g., play-off games, tiered competitions), approval to schedule an event which will result in student absences or missed assignments must be secured from the administrative officer directly above the sponsoring unit (e.g., college dean, director of athletics, etc) AND then, unless completion of the assignment is precluded by policies stated in the class syllabus, the instructor will make an effort to accommodate even these less timely requests, though **accommodation should not be assumed or taken for granted** (see Instructors section, below).
4. Provide each participating student with an "Assignment Completion Form" for each of the student's affected classes at the time the list of events is distributed.
5. Seek resolution of conflicts with the instructor, in cases where the syllabus is silent, as early as possible. If the syllabus contains a policy precluding completion due to the nature of a particular assignment, however, the sponsor and the student will accept the syllabus as the definitive policy statement and arrange the student's activity schedule to accommodate classroom demands.

Students shall:

1. Provide the sponsor of the activity with a list of classes (and their syllabi) which conflict with any proposed university sponsored activity. This list should be presented during or before the first week of each term.
2. Be responsible for all material covered in class during their absence. Students are responsible for completing all work, (see syllabus), resulting from their absence.
3. Present an "Assignment Completion Form" to instructors in all affected courses and return the signed form(s) to the sponsor of the activity before the end of the second week of the semester.

Instructors are requested to:

1. Respond to requests to complete missed work due to university sponsored events as outlined here. If the course syllabus includes assignments that cannot be completed outside of class, the instructor agrees to provide an explanation on the "Assignment Completion Form."
2. Try to accommodate a first request from a student participating in a university sponsored program.
3. Try to accommodate students who request an opportunity to complete a missed assignment due to an absence related to a university sponsored event.
4. Sign the "Assignment Completion Form" when instructor and student have reached agreement and keep a copy.

ASSIGNMENT COMPLETION FORM

Course: _____ Instructor: _____

Student: _____

Listed below are requirements and assignment completion dates for the above student who will be absent from class due to participation in a University Sponsored Event.

Date of Absence	Assignment/Test/Other	Assignment Completion Date
------------------------	------------------------------	-----------------------------------

j†Some assignments can only be completed in class at the assigned time.

Comments:

I understand the Guidelines for Absence Due to Participation in University Sponsored Events and agree with the above requirements regarding completion of coursework due to absence from class to participate in a University Sponsored Event.

Sponsor

Date

Student

Date

Instructor

Date

APPENDIX F

Proposals Approved By Provost To Faculty Senate May 2007

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-07-003	Mod Lang	Add new course 3500:597 Individual Reading in Modern Languages
AS-07-007	Pol Sci	Add course 3700:437/537 Government Versus Organized Crime
AS-07-025	Geography	Add course 3350:446/546 GIS Programming and Customization
AS-07-036	Biology	Delete BA degree in Biology
AS-07-062	Sociology	Change course 3850:344 to 3850:447/547
AS-07-074	Sociology	Change course title 3850:320 and bulletin description
AS-07-087	Pol Sci	Add portfolio requirements to JD/Master of Applied Politics
AS-07-090	Sociology	Update sociology bulletin description
AS-07-091	Sociology	Change prereqs for 3850:421
AS-07-092	Sociology	Change requirements for Sociology Graduate Program Comprehensive Exam Degree
AS-07-093	Sociology	Delete course 3850:423, Add course 3850:325
AS-07-094	Chemistry	Add new course 3150:592 Special Topics: Chemical Education
AS-07-095	Biology	Delete course 3100:484 Pharmacology
AS-07-096	Biology	Delete course 3100:584 Pharmacology
AS-07-097	History	Change requirements for History Minor
AS-07-099	Econ	Change prereqs for all graduate level courses
AS-07-100	CSAA	Change prereqs for all graduate level courses
AS-07-101	CSAA	Change prereq for 3240:520 and 3240:572
AS-07-102	History	Change prereq for 3400:500

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
ED-07-04	Ed Found	Change prereqs for admission to Ed.D.
ED-07-08	Phys & HE	Change in courses required for Exercise Science program completion
ED-07-11	Ed Found	Change prereqs for graduate level courses
ED-07-13	C&I	Change course title 5250:350
ED-07-14	C&I	Add course 7100:594 to requirements for completion of MS with licensure
ED-07-15	C&I	Delete course 5200:300 Kindergarten Policies, Issues & Trends
ED-07-17	C&I	Change course title 5610:485
ED-07-18	C&I	Add course 5610:488 Student Teaching: Early Childhood/Early Childhood Intervention Specialist
ED-07-19	C&I	Add correct course to bulletin description
ED-07-20	C&I	Delete course 5200:310 Introduction to Early Childhood

		Education
ED-07-21	C&I	Delete course 5200:315 Issues & Trends in EC Education
ED-07-22	C&I	Delete course 5200:316 Kindergarten C&I
ED-07-23	C&I	Delete course 5200:333 Teaching Science to Young Children
ED-07-24	C&I	Delete course 5200:338 Teaching Social Studies to Young Children
ED-07-25	C&I	Delete course 5200:355 Language and Literacy in Early Childhood
ED-07-26	C&I	Delete course 5200:365 Comprehensive Musicianship for Early Childhood
ED-07-27	C&I	Delete course 5200:450 Integrated Curriculum Application in the Elementary School
ED-07-28	C&I	Delete course 5300:594
ED-07-29	C&I	Delete course 5500:481/570 Multicultural Education in the United States
ED-07-30	C&I	Delete course 5500:482/571 Characteristics of Culturally Diverse Populations
ED-07-31	C&I	Delete course 5500:483/572 Preparation for Teaching Culturally Diverse Populations
ED-07-32	C&I	Delete course 5610:450 Special Education Programming: Early Childhood
ED-07-33	C&I	Delete course 5500:565 Vocational Business Education
ED-07-34	C&I	Delete course 5500:610 Education and the Young Child
ED-07-35	C&I	Change prereq for 5610:544
ED-07-36	C&I	Change course number and title 5200:480
ED-07-37	C&I	Change course number and title 5500:480/780
ED-07-38	Phys & HE	Add background check to Athletic Training for Sports Medicine programs
ED-07-39	Phys & HE	Change credit hours for 5570:421
ED-07-45	Phys & HE	Change prereqs for graduate level courses
ED-07-46	Phys & HE	Change program name to Exercise Science
ED-07-47	Phys & HE	Change program name to Sport Studies
ED-07-49	Phys & HE	Change program name to Athletic Training
ED-07-50	Phys & HE	Change course title and credit 5550:204
ED-07-51	Phys & HE	Change course title 5550:193
ED-07-53	Phys & HE	Change course title and credit 5550:102
ED-07-54	Phys & HE	Change course title and credit 5570:420

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
EN-07-20	Chem Eng	Change prereqs for all graduate level courses
EN-07-30	Civil Eng	Change prereqs for all graduate level courses
EN-07-45	Elect Eng	Change course title and credits 4400:598
EN-07-57	Elect Eng	Change course title, credits, and number 4450:597
EN-07-65	Mech Eng	Change course credits 4600:664
EN-07-80	Biomed Eng	Change prereqs for all graduate level courses
EN-07-86	Biomed Eng	Change prereqs for 4800:650

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
FAA-07-112	SLPA	Change course title and credits 7700:749
FAA-07-114	SLPA	Change course title, credits, and bulletin description 7700:751
FAA-07-115	SLPA	Add course 7700:899 Doctoral Enrollment/Residency
FAA-07-131	Art	Add course 7100:503 Art and Critical Theory
FAA-07-138	Art	Add course 7100:507 Methods of Art History
FAA-07-141	Art	Delete course 7100:500 Art in the US before WWII
FAA-07-143	Art	Add course 7100:403 Art and Critical Theory
FAA-07-145	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:224
FAA-07-147	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:122
FAA-07-148	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:220
FAA-07-149	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:219
FAA-07-150	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:228
FAA-07-151	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:229
FAA-07-152	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:328
FAA-07-153	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:329
FAA-07-154	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:230
FAA-07-155	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:351
FAA-07-156	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:451
FAA-07-157	Dance	Change prereqs for 7900:145
FAA-07-158	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:246
FAA-07-159	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:357
FAA-07-160	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:141
FAA-07-161	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:341
FAA-07-162	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:222
FAA-07-163	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:322
FAA-07-164	Dance	Change prereqs for 7920:422

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Provost Office

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
SC-07-01	Eng & Sci Tech	Add elective to AAS Construction Engineering Technology; change prereqs for 2990:125
SC-07-02	Eng & Sci Tech	Change electives BS Construction Engineering Technology

SC-07-29	Pub Svc Tech	Add course 2220:226 Interviews, Interrogations, and Hostage Negotiations
SC-07-30	Pub Svc Tech	Add course 2220:224 Profiling Serial Killers
SC-07-33	Pub Svc Tech	Add course 2220:262 Victimology and Criminal Justice System
SC-07-48	Pub Svc Tech	Change electives and requirements for Community Services Technology: General Option program
SC-07-55	Pub Svc Tech	Change mode of delivery for 2220:270
SC-07-62	Pub Svc Tech	Change credits for course 2260:263
SC-07-70	Pub Svc Tech	Delete Office Administration International Secretarial option
SC-07-75	Pub Svc Tech	Change name of Security Administration option
SC-07-77	Allied Health	Add options to BS Respiratory Therapy program
SC-07-78	Pub Svc Tech	Change requirements and electives for Fire Protection Technology program
SC-07-86	Pub Svc Tech	Change prereqs for 2220:280
SC-07-87	Pub Svc Tech	Add course 2220:275 Legal Aspects of Corrections
SC-07-88	Assoc Studies	Change course 2030:161
SC-07-92	Pub Svc Tech	Add course 2260:255 Effective Workplace Relationships

University Libraries

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Proposals Approved By Provost
New Programs to Faculty Senate and Board of Trustees
May 2007

Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences

Proposal No.	Department	Title
AS-07-048	Pol Sci	Add Certificate program in Cross-Cultural negotiation
AS-07-064	History	Add graduate certificate program in Asian and Middle Eastern Studies

College of Business Administration

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Education

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Fine and Applied Arts

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

School of Law

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Nursing

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

College of Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Summit College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

University College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

Wayne College

Proposal No.	Department	Title
--------------	------------	-------

APPENDIX G

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Tuesday, April 24, 2007
 AKRON, OHIO 44325
 Final 2007 Summer Graduation Statistics Report

Page 1 of 3

		Number	In	Across	Marching	Marching
		Conferred	Absentia	Stage	w/Other	Not
Number of Degrees:					Degree	Graduating
<u>The Graduate School</u>						
<u>Doctorate Candidates</u>						
1	12 Doctor of Philosophy	19	19	0	0	0
	Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	19	19	0	0	0
1	14 Doctor of Philosophy	10	10	0	0	0
	Total College of Engineering	10	10	0	0	0
1	18 Doctor of Philosophy	8	8	0	0	0
1	19 Doctor of Education	1	1	0	0	0
	Total College of Education	9	9	0	0	0
1	21 Doctor of Audiology	6	6	0	0	0
	Total Fine and Applied Arts	6	6	0	0	0
1	25 Doctor of Philosophy	7	7	0	0	0
	Total Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering	7	7	0	0	0
	Total Doctorate	51	51	0	0	0
<u>Masters Candidates</u>						
1	37 Master of Applied Politics	1	1	0	0	0
1	40 Master of Arts	14	14	0	0	0
1	50 Master of Public Administration	5	5	0	0	0
1	55 Master of Science	20	20	0	0	0
	Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences	40	40	0	0	0
1	60 Master of Science in Chemical Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
1	80 Master of Science in Electrical Engineering	8	8	0	0	0
1	90 Master of Science in Engineering	4	4	0	0	0
1	100 Master of Science in Mechanical Engineering	3	3	0	0	0
	Total College of Engineering	16	16	0	0	0
1	110 Master of Arts in Education	57	57	0	0	0
1	120 Master of Science in Education	21	21	0	0	0
1	130 Master of Science in Technical Education	2	2	0	0	0
	Total College of Education	80	80	0	0	0
1	139 Master of Science in Accountancy	5	5	0	0	0
1	150 Master of Business Administration	20	20	0	0	0
1	160 Master of Science in Management	5	5	0	0	0
1	170 Master of Taxation	3	3	0	0	0
	Total College of Business Administration	33	33	0	0	0
1	180 Master of Arts	5	5	0	0	0
1	192 Master of Arts in Family and Consumer Sciences	3	3	0	0	0
1	200 Master of Music	10	10	0	0	0
	Total Fine and Applied Arts	18	18	0	0	0

1	209 Master of Public Health		1	1	0	0	0
1	210 Master of Science in Nursing		30	30	0	0	0
	Total College of Nursing		31	31	0	0	0
1	211 Master of Science		1	1	0	0	0
	Total Polymer Science and Polymer Engineering		1	1	0	0	0
	<i>Total Masters</i>		219	219	0	0	0
	<u>Total Graduate</u>		270	270	0	0	0

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Tuesday, April 24, 2007

Page 2 of 3

AKRON, OHIO 44325

Final 2007 Summer Graduation Statistics Report

		Number	In	Across	Marching	Marching
		Conferred	Absentia	Stage	w/Other	Not
Number of Degrees:					Degree	Graduating
<u>Undergraduate Degrees</u>						
<u>Baccalaureate Candidates</u>						
Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences						
1	220 Bachelor of Arts	54	54	0	0	0
1	227 Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Anthropology	5	5	0	0	0
1	228 Bachelor of Arts in Interdisciplinary Studies	2	2	0	0	0
1	230 Bachelor of Science	43	43	0	0	0
1	235 Bachelor of Science in Computer Science	2	2	0	0	0
1	250 Bachelor of Science in Labor Economics	1	1	0	0	0
1	270 Bachelor of Science in Political Science/Criminal Justice	17	17	0	0	0
Total Buchtel College of Arts and Sciences		124	124	0	0	0
College of Engineering						
1	278 Bachelor of Science in Biomedical Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
1	290 Bachelor of Science in Civil Engineering	2	2	0	0	0
1	295 Bachelor of Science in Computer Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
1	310 Bachelor of Science in Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
1	320 Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering	5	5	0	0	0
1	325 Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Polymer Engineering	1	1	0	0	0
Total College of Engineering		11	11	0	0	0
College of Education						
1	340 Bachelor of Arts in Education	3	3	0	0	0
1	350 Bachelor of Science in Education	13	13	0	0	0
1	360 Bachelor of Science in Technical Education	2	2	0	0	0
Total College of Education		18	18	0	0	0
College of Business Administration						
1	370 Bachelor of Science in Accounting	25	25	0	0	0
1	375 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration	6	6	0	0	0
1	378 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Advertising	4	4	0	0	0
1	380 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Finance	11	11	0	0	0
1	383 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/International Business	8	8	0	0	0
1	390 Bachelor of Science in Business Administration/Marketing	22	22	0	0	0
1	405 Bachelor of Science in Management	11	11	0	0	0
Total College of Business Administration		87	87	0	0	0
Fine and Applied Arts						
1	410 Bachelor of Arts	19	19	0	0	0
1	430 Bachelor of Arts in Business and Organizational Communication	26	26	0	0	0
1	480 Bachelor of Arts in Family and Child Development	20	20	0	0	0
1	482 Bachelor of Arts in Fashion Merchandising	1	1	0	0	0
1	507 Bachelor of Arts in Interpersonal and Public Communication	1	1	0	0	0
1	510 Bachelor of Arts in Mass Media - Communication	7	7	0	0	0
1	520 Bachelor of Arts/Social Work	13	13	0	0	0
1	531 Bachelor of Arts in Speech - Language Pathology and Audiology	1	1	0	0	0
1	540 Bachelor of Arts in Theatre Arts	2	2	0	0	0

1	550 Bachelor of Fine Arts		9	9	0	0	0
1	560 Bachelor of Music		1	1	0	0	0
	Total Fine and Applied Arts		100	100	0	0	0
	College of Nursing						
1	570 Bachelor of Science in Nursing		54	54	0	0	0
	Total College of Nursing		54	54	0	0	0

THE UNIVERSITY OF AKRON Tuesday, April 24, 2007

Page 3 of 3

AKRON, OHIO 44325

Final 2007 Summer Graduation Statistics Report

		Number	In	Across	Marching	Marching
		Conferred	Absentia	Stage	w/Other	Not
Number of Degrees:					Degree	Graduating
Summit College						
1	576 Bachelor of Science in Automated Manufacturing Engineering Technology	1	1	0	0	0
1	577 Bachelor of Science in Computer Information Systems	1	1	0	0	0
1	578 Bachelor of Science in Construction Engineering Technology	4	4	0	0	0
1	581 Bachelor of Science in Electronic Engineering Technology	1	1	0	0	0
1	584 Bachelor of Science in Emergency Management	6	6	0	0	0
1	586 Bachelor of Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology	3	3	0	0	0
1	596 Bachelor of Science in Surveying and Mapping Technology	4	4	0	0	0
Total Summit College		20	20	0	0	0
Total Baccalaureate		414	414	0	0	0
Associate Candidates						
Summit College						
1	600 Associate of Arts	7	7	0	0	0
1	630 Associate of Applied Business in Business Management Technology	3	3	0	0	0
1	642 Associate of Applied Business in Computer Information Systems	4	4	0	0	0
1	670 Associate of Applied Business in Hospitality Management	3	3	0	0	0
1	740 Associate of Applied Science in Community Services Technology	9	9	0	0	0
1	745 Associate of Applied Science in Construction Engineering Technology	6	6	0	0	0
1	750 Associate of Applied Science in Criminal Justice Technology	17	17	0	0	0
1	771 Associate of Applied Science in Drafting and Computer Drafting	2	2	0	0	0
1	775 Associate of Applied Science in Early Childhood Development	2	2	0	0	0
1	792 Associate of Applied Science in Emergency Medical Services Technology	2	2	0	0	0
1	800 Associate of Applied Science in Fire Protection Technology	7	7	0	0	0
1	831 Associate of Applied Science in Manufacturing Engineering Technology	2	2	0	0	0
1	841 Associate of Applied Science in Mechanical Engineering Technology	2	2	0	0	0
1	850 Associate of Applied Science in Medical Assisting Technology	3	3	0	0	0
1	854 Associate of Applied Science in Paralegal Studies	1	1	0	0	0
1	855 Associate of Applied Science in Polymer Technology	1	1	0	0	0
1	860 Associate of Applied Science in Radiologic Technology	30	30	0	0	0
1	885 Associate of Applied Science in Surgical Technology	18	18	0	0	0
1	893 Associate of Applied Science in Surveying Engineering Technology	4	4	0	0	0
Total Summit College		123	123	0	0	0
Wayne College						
1	900 Associate of Arts	3	3	0	0	0
1	910 Associate of Science	7	7	0	0	0
1	912 Associate of Applied Business in Business Management Technology	4	4	0	0	0
1	915 Associate of Applied Business in Health Care Office Management	2	2	0	0	0
1	919 Associate of Applied Business in Office Technology	2	2	0	0	0
1	925 Associate of Applied Science in Computer Network Engineering Technology	1	1	0	0	0
1	930 Associate of Applied Science in Computer Service and Network	1	1	0	0	0
1	940 Associate of Applied Science in Social Services Technology	1	1	0	0	0
Total Wayne College		21	21	0	0	0

	<i>Total Associate</i>	144	144	0
0	0			
	<u>Total Undergraduate</u>	558	558	0
0	0			
	Total Degrees for The University of Akron	828	828	0
0	0			

APPENDIX H
AMENDED LIST 4/16/07
2007 Summer Fellowships
Awarded 03/09/07

<u>ACCT.#</u>	<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
2-07619	1656	Dr. Constance Bouchard History	The Thirteenth-Century Cartulary of the Bishopric of Auxerre.	\$ 8,000.00
2-07620	1657	Dr. Valerie Callanan Sociology	Suicides as Responses to Relation- ship Inequity and Violations in the Norm of Reciprocity.	8,000.00
2-07621	1658	Dr. Chien-Chung Chan Computer Science	A Framework for Knowledge Engineering.	8,000.00
2-07622	1659	Dr. Patrick Chura English	Louise Bryant's Radical Influence on the Stagecraft of Eugene O'Neill.	8,000.00
2-07623	1660	Dr. Javier Coronado-Aliegro Modern Languages	Enhancing Self-Efficacy in the Spanish as a Foreign Language Classroom: The Impact of Continuous Self-Assessment.	8,000.00
2-07624	1661	Dr. Cheryl Elman Sociology	The Life Course Timing of Education and the Onset of Morbidity.	8,000.00
2-07625	1662	Dr. Teena Jennings-Rentenaar School of Family and Consumer Sciences	The Documentation of Wild Silk Production in Madagascar and its Application to Indigenous Silk in Ohio.	8,000.00
2-07626	1663	Dr. Richard Londrville Biology	Proteomics Studies in Sharks and Manatees.	4,500.00
2-07627	1664	Dr. Bi-min Zhang Newby Chemical and Biomolecular Engineering	Utilizing Self-Assembled Monolayers for Immobilizing b2AR, a Model G-Protein Coupled Receptor, for High Throughput Screening.	8,000.00
2-07628	1665	Dr. Stacey Nofziger Sociology	An Empirical Integration of Self- Control and Lifestyles Theories to Explain Juvenile Violence and Victimization.	8,000.00
2-07629	1666	Dr. Hillary Nunn English	Cravings and Character: Staging the Pregnant Woman in the Early Modern Theater.	8,000.00
2-07630	1667	Dr. Robert Peralta Sociology	Alcohol Use Among College Youth: The Impact of Race and Gender.	8,000.00

<u>ACCT.#</u>	<u>FRG#</u>	<u>NAME</u>	<u>TITLE OF PROJECT</u>	<u>AMOUNT</u>
2-07631	1668	Dr.Zhong-Hui Duan Computer Science	A Gene Ontology Based Computational Approach for Large- Scale Protein Function Predictions.	8,000.00
2-07632	1669	Dr. Martha Santos History	Cleansing Honor with Blood: Masculinity, Honor, and Violence in the Brazilian Backlands. Ceara, 1845-1889.	8,000.00
2-07633	1670	Dr. Linda Creadon Shanks Nursing	A Pilot Study to Examine the Relation- ships Among External Counterpulsation, Heart Failure Pathology, Functional Capacity, and Quality of Life.	8,000.00
2-07634	1671	Mr. Mark Soppeland Art	Seen in China, an Exhibition of Con- temporary Chinese Photography.	8,000.00
2-07635	1672	Dr. Mary Triece Communication	We Were Might and We Were Right: Mother-Activism In the National Welfare Rights Movement.	8,000.00
2-07636	1673	Dr. Kathleen Tusaie Nursing	Development and Initial Testing of the Computerized Cognitive Skill Building Program.	8,000.00
2-07637	1674	Dr. Zhenhai Xia Mechanical Engineering	Adhesion and Self-Cleaning of Gecko and Bio-mimetic Adhesives.	8,000.00
2-07638	1675	Dr. Yang Yun Biomedical Engineering	Controlled Release of SiRNA in LTP Nanospheres for Therapeutic Gene Silencing Applications in Wound Healing.	8,000.00
2-07639	1676	Dr. Baomei Zhao School of Family and Consumer Sciences	Comparative Research on Tobacco Consumption Among Teenagers in China and the U.S.	8,000.00
2-07640	1677	Dr. Gang Zhao History	Reshaping the Asian Trade Network: The Construction and Execution of the Chinese Open Trade Policy in 1684- 1840.	8,000.00
2-07641	1678	Dr. Jiang Zhe Mechanical Engineering	A Microfluidic Sensor for Online Oil Debris and Property Monitoring.	8,000.00

FUNDING TOTAL; \$180,500

APPENDIX I

Student Advisory Committee report

The Student Advisory Committee was charged with investigating the recent resolution that enabled Greek Life to fine fraternities and sororities turning in late roster, e-mail addresses, etc. Faculty Senate received a question from Don Canary (Academic Advising and Faculty Advisor Lone Star Fraternity). Mr. Canary questioned whether any student organization could impose a fine without passing through the Faculty Senate.

Senator Gamble met with Thad Doyle, Assistant Director of Greek Life to discuss the issue. Mr. Doyle welcomed the meeting to discuss the issue and hoped this opened the door to a positive and active relationship between both the Office of Greek Life Programs and Faculty Senate. Mr. Doyle reported that many of the fraternities and sororities which were compliant with turning in paperwork on time questioned why others who didn't comply didn't receive some form of discipline. This issue was taken to Mr. Doyle supervisor, Dr. Michele Cambell at the beginning of Fall 2006 semester. This issue was also discussed with Dean Denine Rocco, with no objection to fining fraternities and sororities for late paperwork. A Greek Leadership Retreat on January 11, 2007, with 21 of the twenty-two organizations had a representative present. The only fraternity voluntarily not present was Lone Star. The issue of accountability was addressed. The resolution was adopted to fine chapters \$25.00 for failing to turn paperwork on time. An email notification was sent to all chapter presidents and campus advisors.

The committee reviewed the senate bylaws. The following is senate by laws with regards to Student affairs committee.

- a. Recommends policy, subject to approval of faculty senate, regarding the granting of scholarships, awards, grants, and loans to university students.
- b. Proposes regulations concerning all extracurricular activities (except athletics) to faculty senate. Recommends to the senate the extension of official recognition of student organizations.

The committee recommended consulting General Council. Senator Gamble contacted Celeste Cooke on the issue. Her recommendation was to have the resolution pass through Faculty Senate. The committee agreed from this investigation another issue surfaced. The question was if the universities extracurricular organizations were aware of the faculty senate bylaw and was it being enforced? The committee recommended meeting with Dean Denine Rocco to discuss this issue.

The Student Affairs Committee will be composing a proposition to vote on in fall or approved by Executive Committee during the summer. The proposition will be to recommend the approval of fines imposed by the Office of Greek Life Programs for chapters failing to adhere to accountability policies. The Student Affairs Committee believes a larger charge of awareness of the senate bylaws and enforcement needs to be addressed.

Respectfully Submitted,

Sherry Gamble
Student Affairs Chair